Pentateuchal criticism,
222.1 S58p 116660

Simpson, David Capell,
Life Pacific College Alumni Library

DATE DUE

222.1
S58p

Simpson, David Capell
Pentateuchal criticism

LIFE Pacific College
Alumni Library
1100 West Covina Blvd.
San Dimas, CA 91773

DEMCO

PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM

THIS second impression reproduces without change the edition published in 1914 with the exception of a footnote on p. 181 and the addition of a Bibliography.

PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM

BY

D. C. SIMPSON, D.D.

TUTOR OF KEBLE COLLEGE, OXFORD
HON. CANON OF SOUTHWELL
EXAMINING CHAPLAIN TO THE BISHOP OF SOUTHWELL

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY THE
RIGHT REV. H. E. RYLE, C.V.O., D.D.

DEAN OF WESTMINSTER
FORMERLY HULSEAN PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
AND BISHOP OF WINCHESTER

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
1924

First Edition published by
HODDER & STOUGHTON

This impression has been produced photographically by the
MUSTON COMPANY

Printed wholly in England for the MUSTON COMPANY
By LOWE & BRYDONE, PRINTERS, LTD.
PARK STREET, CAMDEN TOWN, LONDON, N.W. 1

8p

L.I.F.E. College Library
1100 Glendale Blvd.
Los Angeles, Calif. 90026

TO THE MEMORY OF

SAMUEL ROLLES DRIVER

025114

INTRODUCTION

The Book on "Pentateuchal Criticism" which is here presented to the reader should receive a warm welcome from Biblical students. There was much need for a clear, temperate, and reverent statement such as that which Mr. Simpson has given us. The ordinary man experiences some difficulty in understanding what the position really is with regard to the literary criticism of the Pentateuch. He is liable to be misled by ignorant controversialists who tell him that Biblical Criticism is hostile to the Christian Faith, and would have him believe that the Documentary Analysis of the Pentateuch is an arbitrary invention of the critics based upon the single argument derived from the varying use of the names of God in Genesis. On the other hand, it is not likely that he will come across, or, if he does, will be equal to the study of, the minute and scientific treatment of the literary problem, such as is to be found in Driver's "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament," or in Chapman's "An Introduction to the Pentateuch."

Mr. Simpson's book will enable him to realize what are the facts. And, indeed, to prevent misconception, it cannot be too often pointed out that Pentateuchal Criticism is not a mere guess based upon the use of the Sacred Names, but represents the result of a long, careful, and extensive process of inductive reasoning applied to the contents of the Sacred Books. The methods which it has followed are those of scientific literary investigation. That is to say, it has had to examine the bearing of the evidence furnished by (1) the varying use of particular words or groups of words, the Sacred Names being only one example of a large class, (2) the marked variety of style, method of writing, selection and treatment of literary material, in different parts of the Pentateuch, (3) the instances of discrepancy, repetition, and inconsistency, inexplicable upon the theory of a homogeneous narrative, and (4) the differing representations of Israelite religion and worship corresponding with different periods in the history of the people. These lines of argument, dealing with language, style, subject-matter, and historical development, have been shown to converge in a measure and degree that carry conviction to the student. The conclusion has been reached that the Pentateuch embodies three main

strata of writing, *i.e.* (1) that of J and E belonging to the period of the earlier Prophets, (2) that of D, belonging to the latter period of the Judean kingdom, and (3) that of P, whose final literary stage may not have been reached until the age of Ezra.

Of course, no critic would pretend to claim that the evidence upon which a distinction can be drawn between the J and the E source of narrative is as varied, clear, or convincing, as that which enables us to distinguish between P and JE. The contents of the P document have been determined upon evidence which seems incapable of being overthrown, and in which the criterion of the Divine Names is only of subordinate importance.

After a useful opening chapter upon the Meaning of Criticism, Mr. Simpson proceeds to explain in detail the nature of the evidence for the separate sources out of which the Pentateuch was compiled, (1) the Priestly Source, (2) J and E, (3) Deuteronomy. Then follows an investigation of the historical aspects of the problem. The concluding chapter deals with the Divine Purpose in Hebrew Religion; and here, as it seems to me, Mr. Simpson has most successfully endeavoured to show how the gradual process of the formation of

the Pentateuch corresponds with successive stages in the preparation of Israel for the coming of the Messiah. So far from its being destructive, or antagonistic to the faith of a Christian and to his reverent acceptance of Holy Scripture as containing the Inspired Word of God, the critical position is found to harmonize with the record of the progressive Revelation of the Divine Will.

I welcome the testimony which a devout student of the Old Testament like Mr. Simpson is able to bear, that the sober and well-reasoned Biblical Criticism of our day, instead of darkening counsel or weakening faith, may be heartily accepted as throwing fresh light upon the way by which Jehovah, who made Himself known to Israel of old, led His people onwards, step by step, towards the full glory that was to be revealed in the Incarnation.

In the *Addenda* to his ninth edition of the "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament" (1913), Dr. Driver, who had seen Mr. Simpson's work in MS., described it as "a lucid and helpful outline of the principles, history, and chief results of the higher criticism of the Pentateuch, with an answer to some objections which have been recently brought forward against

it." He had kindly undertaken to write an Introduction to it. He was prevented by his last illness from carrying out his promise; and this troubled him very much. A short time before the end came, he expressed an earnest desire that I would consent to write the Introduction to Mr. Simpson's book in his place. This will explain how it happens that, with Mr. Simpson's kind approval, I have written these few lines of Foreword. I have felt it a privilege to be allowed to carry out the dying wish of a most affectionate and true friend.

In Dr. Driver we have lost the foremost Old Testament scholar of our day. Intellectually he was incomparably well equipped, with great gifts of linguistic ability, with a natural sobriety and trained sagacity of judgement, and with the happy command of a lucid and flexible literary style. His was one of the most modest and single-minded characters. He devoted himself whole-heartedly to the work of Biblical study. He wasted no time upon speculative conjectures. His energies were concentrated upon the elucidation of the sacred text. We who remain thank God for the example of the life and work of a devout, reverent, and fearless Biblical scholar and critic. We should thank God also for his personal influence as a

teacher, a counsellor, and a friend, and for the wonderful output of writings, all of first-class eminence, which his unsparing industry has bequeathed to grateful Bible students.

HERBERT E. RYLE
Bishop

The Deanery
Westminster, *March* 23, 1914

PREFATORY NOTE

My sincere thanks are due to Bishop Ryle for so kindly contributing to the present volume an Introduction in place of that which Dr. Driver was prevented from writing only by his unexpected and lamented death.

With all that Dr. Ryle has there written with regard to Dr. Driver I should like fully to associate myself. It is impossible adequately to express one's gratitude for the constant enthusiasm which he displayed as a teacher and the unfailing kindness which he showed as a friend.

It was in a suggestion of Dr Driver's that the present volume originated, and I am deeply conscious that in many points of arrangement and of detail it owes not a little of such clearness and accuracy as it can claim to his unceasing interest in this subject, and to his characteristic willingness to place at the disposal of others his own sound judgement and unrivalled scholarship.

D. C. SIMPSON

Oxford, *Easter Eve*, 1914

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION: BY THE RIGHT REV. H. E. RYLE, C.V.O., D.D. vii

PREFATORY NOTE xiii

CHAPTER I

THE MEANING OF CRITICISM 1

CHAPTER II

THE HISTORY OF PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM . . 22

NOTE: THE BEARING OF ARCHÆOLOGY ON THE CRITICISM OF THE PENTATEUCH 35

CHAPTER III

THE PRIESTLY SOURCE 41

APPENDIX: CHARACTERISTIC EXPRESSIONS OF P, WITH A LIST OF THE PASSAGES IN THE HEXATEUCH ASSIGNED TO P 65

CHAPTER IV

THE SOURCES J AND E 72

CHAPTER V

DEUTERONOMY 94

CHAPTER VI

PAGE

THE PENTATEUCH IN THE LIGHT OF HEBREW HISTORY AND IN RELATION TO THE ELEPHANTINE PAPYRI . 123

CHAPTER VII

THE DIVINE PURPOSE IN HEBREW RELIGION . . 150

APPENDIX

THE NAMES OF GOD IN THE PENTATEUCH . . 177

BIBLIOGRAPHY

RECENT LITERATURE 203

INDEXES 207

CHAPTER I

THE MEANING OF CRITICISM

"To see an object as in itself it really is has been justly said to be the aim of all true criticism." [1] True criticism, then, is discrimination, the passing of judgment upon the qualities of anything. In relation, for example, to an artistic work an important function of criticism is to form an estimate of its qualities and character, either as an end in itself, or as a means of determining the date and authorship of the work in question. Let us suppose that a critic is endeavouring to ascertain who actually painted some ancient picture. He will be aware that the authenticity of even signed paintings needs corroboration, that the presence upon a picture of an artist's signature is no proof that the picture is actually that artist's work. It may be a copy of his original painting, like it in a general degree, yet revealing itself to the expert as differing in quality. Or again, some details only in it may be his work, for great artists such as Signorelli, Titian, Raphael, or Rubens, at times signed pictures of which they themselves painted only portions, and those perhaps very slight. The artistic conventions of an earlier day authorised an artist to regard as *his* work all that was done under his direction, though his pupils might have executed and even designed it. The addition of the artist's signature implied, therefore, no

[1] Walter Pater, *The Renaissance*, 1873, p. viii.

intention to deceive.[1] An inferior painter would even add the signature of a famous artist to his own work if he honestly believed that he had produced something in that artist's style, and the conventions of his day held him justified in so doing. In such an enquiry, therefore, as we are here supposing, the critic will invariably act on the canon of criticism that perfect identity of characteristics—that is, of those features which distinguish the work of each school of artists and of each individual artist within each school—alone demonstrates absolute identity of origin. He will examine such details as, *e.g.*, the type of face, the treatment of hands, eyes, dress, landscape, or the use of light and shade. He will decide whether there is in such respects complete identity with the indisputable work of *any one* master or whether incongruities of style and inequalities of execution in any of these details find their legitimate explanation only in the hypothesis that the picture is the work of two or three different artists. Though in such an examination the points of resemblance may prove greatly to outnumber and outweigh those of dissimilarity, yet it is important to notice that it is upon the latter alone that he can rely for the immediate purpose and that it is upon them that he lays most stress. In every case accurate and trained observation alone can tell the critic just what peculiar characteristics, if any, mark the work of one painter, and what that of another; but when discovered these characteristics become very valuable as

[1] *E.g.* Frederick, Duke of Mantua, begs Titian "to send him works which have his touch as well as his signature." See B. Berenson, *The Study and Criticism of Italian Art*, Second Series, 1902, p. 114. On the whole of this branch of art criticism the essay in this volume entitled *Rudiments of Connoisseurship* should be especially consulted. *Cf.* also A. P. Laurie, *The Pigments and Mediums of the Old Masters.*

evidence for the discrimination of the characteristics of other painters.[1]

From artistic criticism to 'textual' criticism may seem a far cry; but the essential nature of 'criticism' remains the same—calm, judicial, impartial *discrimination*. The special object of all *textual* criticism is to recover so far as possible the actual words written by any given author. In a book printed to-day no question arises as to what are the statements in it for which its author is actually responsible. But in the case of literature of earlier days there is often considerable doubt; *e.g.* in the case of the plays of Shakespeare there are in the different early editions considerable variations in the text; and one of the first tasks of Shakespearean scholars has been that of reconstructing, in accordance with the relative values assigned to the early editions, what was most probably the actual text that Shakespeare wrote. And when we come to more remote times, in which literature existed only in manuscript form, the problem, while still of the same kind, grows much more difficult in degree.

But whether or not the *text* may be regarded as already definitely settled, other important questions must be investigated by the scholar whom, for want of a better

[1] The reader will see for himself how closely allied to the function of criticism sketched above are some of its functions in other branches of Art. One need here only allude in passing to the means by which the expert in architecture determines the age of an ancient building and often discriminates between its various parts, assigning them on account of their characteristics of style to different architectural epochs. (For an admirable comparison of the structure of the Pentateuch with the fabric of a Cathedral see Carpenter and Harford, *The Composition of the Hexateuch*, 1902, pp. 26 f.) In regard to musical criticism in general, see, *e.g.*, D. F. Tovey, *Permanent Musical Criteria*, in the *Proceedings of the Musical Association*, 1903–4, pp. 129–49; Dr. Percy C. Buck, *Prolegomena to Musical Criticism*, in the *Proceedings of the Musical Association*, 1905–6, pp. 155–77.

and more distinctive name, we may for the present call the 'literary' or 'documentary' critic. The province of such a critic is easily indicated. It falls to his lot to determine, by the help of whatever *data* are available, the date and author of a book, or, if the evidence points in this direction, the authors of its various parts; and to investigate the sources—especially if they are written sources—which the author or authors employed.

Now in a modern book the title-page and preface should settle questions of authorship or date, while the modern canon which disallows deliberate plagiarism also makes the documentary critic's task a simple one. But this has not always been the case. To return to Shakespeare, for example, in addition to the great mass of his genuine works, various plays have at one time or another been attributed to him which, it is now established beyond doubt, he never wrote. Again, as regards the incorporation, whether with or without modification, of sections from other sources, it cannot be too insistently pointed out that our modern standard in such matters is only of recent origin. Even Shakespeare did not hesitate to 'work up' plays written by others before him, while whole speeches in some of the historical dramas are mere paraphrases of the (extant) sources from which he drew.[1]

The remoter the period, the more these problems

[1] Professor Sayce's last sentence of his Preface to Dahse's pamphlet, from which some other words will be quoted on p. 20 below, is obscure. Does he mean that no one but Dr. Fleay has ever examined the problems of the stylistic and literary peculiarities, date, authorship, sources, of any of the plays rightly or wrongly attributed to Shakespeare? Or does he rather mean that Shakespearean scholars are unconvinced as to Fleay's *results*? If the former, Furness' *Variorum Edition of Shakespeare* and many other works show that such methods are consistently and inflexibly applied by Shakespearean scholars to Shakespearean problems. If the latter, it is because they themselves apply more correctly than Fleay the methods which Biblical critics adopt.

increase in difficulty. A manuscript may not bear any name; even if it does, that is no proof of the correctness of the attribution: the transcriber did not necessarily take it from the original or from an earlier copy; he may have added it himself. At any rate its presence is no proof that the work in question is that of the man whose name is attached to it. Similarly, the date of a work is often to be settled only by accidental references in contemporary literature, or, again, by incidental allusions in the work itself to contemporary events. Should both these means fail, the critic has still that other criterion which he values equally with them, viz. literary and linguistic style—as also that further one of the point of view and mental attitude—characterising the work in question.

Let us then be quite clear that this, and this alone, constitutes 'documentary' or 'literary criticism,' in the sense in which we have used the term. It is not a discussion of the credibility of, say, any miraculous incidents which may be recorded in a narrative to which it is applied, nor an attempt to *interpret* any results of its application, or to suggest explanations of the phenomena appearing in the document in question. Still less is it concerned with speculations as to the origin or legitimacy of religious beliefs, or as to the extent, if any, of their interrelation with other religious beliefs, whether of the same or of surrounding nations or systems. Thus 'documentary criticism' of Homeric literature, for example, does not affect its ultimate religious significance for the spiritual experience either of its original authors or of the Greeks who read it in subsequent days. The peculiar type of thought exhibited by an ancient document remains the same whether the critic of to-day himself happens to acquiesce in it or not. Hence no

presuppositions, whether of rationalism or of revelation, play a part in the work of the documentary critic; he is concerned solely with his document and its problems.

This last point is emphasised here so strongly, because there exists an alternative name for this 'literary' or 'documentary' criticism described above, viz. 'Higher Criticism'—the object in some quarters of so much suspicion and even hatred.[1] This latter term, when used in its proper sense, means nothing more than the former; in fact "the term 'Higher Criticism' is used correctly only when 'Documentary Criticism' is capable of being substituted for it without detriment to the sense."[2] It may, indeed, be regretted that a term is employed which is so liable to misconception and misuse, and so suggestive to some minds of an intensified and exaggerated form of 'criticism,' as the term is ordinarily understood. As a matter of fact, scholars who are referred to under this term 'higher critics' themselves rarely use it. When they do so, they use it strictly in its proper significance; it is their opponents who use it in a wider and erroneous sense. These opponents confuse it with historical criticism, with the theories of the historical critic, the surmises of the anthropologist, or the hypotheses of the student of comparative religion.

[1] Those who are a prey to such feelings with regard to 'Higher Criticism' might realise how baseless are their apprehensions if they would but read, for instance, the late Dean Farrar's opening chapter entitled *Higher Criticism* in his Introduction to *The First Book of Kings* (in *The Expositor's Bible*), 1893.

[2] For further explanation see especially Driver, *The Critical Study of the Old Testament*, pp. 39–41 ("Essays for the Times," No. 21). This helpful sketch of our problem was first published in *The Contemporary Review* for February 1890, and, though twenty-three years have since elapsed, not a single proposition which it enunciates has been successfully challenged.

We have shown already that in its province it is entirely distinct from all of these, as it is also narrower in its scope.

Moreover, to these opponents the mere adjective 'higher' in the one expression 'higher criticism' has, it would seem, the ring of arrogance, or superciliousness. But a person who cultivates, or commends, 'higher education,' or the study of 'higher mathematics,' is not abused, or charged with arrogance, or denounced as supercilious. And, as will immediately appear, there is nothing whatever in the term, when rightly understood, to imply these defects.

Neither the method as explained above, nor the name, was first used of *Biblical* criticism or employed by *Biblical* critics. This is amply illustrated by Eichhorn's well-known words, written as long ago as 1787: "I have been obliged to bestow the greatest amount of labour on a hitherto entirely unworked field, the investigation of the inner constitution of the particular writings of the Old Testament by the aid of the Higher Criticism (a new name to no Humanist)."[1] These Humanists, or students of the ancient Classics, therefore, it was who first adopted this particular nomenclature. They may have used it because this province involves a 'higher' and more difficult kind of work than 'textual' criticism, and is also one with higher aims. At any rate 'Higher Criticism' merely deals with problems *higher*, as it were, up the stream of history than does 'Textual Criticism,' which is therefore sometimes known also as 'Lower Criticism.'[2]

[1] See the Preface to the 2nd edition of his *Einleitung ins Alte Testament*, p. vi.

[2] Eichhorn's clear exposition of the scope of 'Higher Criticism,' and of its difference from 'Lower' or 'Textual Criticism,' is worth quoting: "When the Higher Criticism has distinguished between the writers, and characterized each of them by his general method, his diction, his

It will suffice lastly and briefly to mention 'historical criticism.' It is this—not 'higher'—criticism which is concerned with the historical values of the *contents* of the documents upon which the 'documentary' critic has entered his judgment, and which endeavours to set them in their true perspective from the point of view of the historian. But in the present volume our concern is not with 'historical criticism.'

Let us turn now to a more detailed examination of some of the methods and results of 'higher,' or 'documentary,' or 'literary' criticism. Different writers the world over have often different styles and points of view. In the Old Testament, for instance, Hosea's writings are marked by the brevity and abruptness of his sentences. In his elder contemporary Amos, however, we find the rhythm of a flowing and artistic style, with a regularity of general structure. As regards point of view, "Amos is the stern moralist; Hosea is the man of religious affection. Amos sees the righteous will of Jehovah pronouncing and executing judgment upon Israel; Hosea has a vision of the loving heart of Jehovah grieving over his erring children."[1] Or take Jeremiah and Ezekiel. The former is distinctly artless, adorning his work with those simple figures which are the outcome of untutored oriental emotion, the spontaneous product of an intensely emotional nature. Nor can his many marked affinities of style with Deuteronomy pass unobserved. While lacking the artistic finish of Amos and the general terseness and energy of all the earlier prophets, his style is less laboured and ornate than that

favourite expressions and other peculiarities, her lower sister, who occupies herself only with words and spies out false readings, lays down her own rules and principles for determining the text, discovering glosses, and detecting interpolations and transpositions."

[1] H. P. Smith, *Old Testament History*, 1903, p. 221.

of Ezekiel. The latter, too, has stereotyped phrases, but they have no affinities with Deuteronomy, while he also displays a noticeable tendency to employ Aramaisms. His style is strikingly prosaic ; and the laboured lucidity of arrangement is produced by careful meditation and literary study. Parables and allegories and detailed descriptions of the abnormal symbolic actions carried out by him constantly occur and are thoughtfully elaborated.[1] Jeremiah's whole nature is a passionate demand for *immediate* communion with God, he is always concerned with the truest aspirations of man's inner spiritual life. Ezekiel, on the other hand, though a prophet and clearly recognising the individual's immediate responsibility to God, expends his powers of description upon the possibilities of communion with God through the medium of the corporate worship of the Temple. Or again, the points of contrast between the Synoptists and the Fourth Gospel might be mentioned. The stylistic differences are admitted on all sides ; the differences in point of view and representation need no elaborate treatment here.

All these cases of differences in style and point of view, accompanying differences of authorship, are clear and unmistakable. But let us suppose that we have to deal with two books which treat of the same general subject, as do those pairs to which we have already referred, but as to the authorship of which we have as yet no knowledge. If we find these two books exhibiting differences from one another in style and treatment, is it not reasonable to infer that these very differences of style and treatment demonstrate difference of authorship ?

[1] For full details and lists of favourite expressions in each case, see further Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (ed. 1, 1891 ; ed. 9, 1913).

But what inferences are to be drawn in cases where differences in literary style and point of view occur *within* what at first sight appears to be a work by a single hand? Is it not logically correct to argue that such differences can only be the result of a diversity of authorship? We have already alluded to the ancient custom of incorporating various sources in one given work. But the reader should notice, as especially significant, the manner in which practically *word for word* extracts from each of the various sources which in such cases the compiler uses are by him inserted *bodily* in his new literary production. As a result, the extracts from these various sources still retain each the distinctive style of its original author. We have numerous instances of this —all incontrovertible, because we still have extant both the composite product and the separate original sources that have gone to the making of that composite product.

Hence it comes about that differences of style and of origin accompany one another and are therefore coterminous with each other. Hence, again, observed differences of style lead us to infer the presence of different sources in the writing in which they occur, even when those sources are no longer extant as separate documents.

Of the use of different sources in a single volume and of the separate survival of some of those sources the Synoptic Gospels are well-known illustrations. For, whatever view is taken of their exact interrelation, the fact remains that of the matter common to S. Matthew and S. Luke a certain amount is found in S. Mark. And, having ascertained this, New Testament critics go on from the characteristic style and contents of other sections common to S. Matthew and S. Luke to argue with considerable success and unanimity that these sections again are taken from another source.

Another excellent example is the *Historia Anglicana* of Bartholomew de Cotton. The sources employed were the chronicles of Roger of Wendover and Matthew Paris, and the compiler's method of using now one, now the other is well illustrated by the Rev. H. R. Luard in the *Rolls Series*, vol. 16, especially pp. xlv f.

Again, take the well-known case of "The Life of Alfred the Great," the growth of which is so lucidly set out in the following quotation :—

"When Archbishop Parker edited Asser's Life of Alfred (1574), he did not hesitate to incorporate into it passages from the so-called Annals of Asser. These Annals were no doubt believed to have proceeded from the same author; Parker's amalgamation of materials thus seemingly enabled the original writer to enrich his story out of his own collections. But a little examination discloses the fact that the Annals were only compiled towards the end of the twelfth century, and contained extracts from many sources, including a life of St. Edmund by Abbo, who wrote at least fourscore years after Asser's death. In republishing Parker's text in 1603, Camden took a further step. Without the faintest hint that he was making any addition, with no attempt to justify himself by manuscript authority, he inserted into the work for the first time the celebrated passage ascribing to Alfred the foundation of the University of Oxford." [1]

Or take but one more instance from the West, the Old English metrical *Genesis*. From the linguistic and metrical peculiarities of the second of the two accounts of the fall of the angels and the temptation, Sievers argued in 1875 that this passage was interpolated from a foreign source—no other than the work of the author of the *Heliand*; how ill-received at first Sievers' conclusion was is shown by Dr. Stopford Brooke in his *Early English Literature*, 1892, vol. ii., p. 97. Sievers' criticism

[1] Carpenter and Harford, *op. cit.*, pp. 5 f.

was, however, fully vindicated by the actual discovery in 1894, in the Vatican library, of fragments of the Old Saxon original for the existence of which he had argued.[1]

As in the West, so in the further East, Buddhism's sacred books—especially that of Buddha's life—or the Hindu Law-book of Manu, exhibit the same phenomena of differences of style and point of view as the concomitants of differences of date and authorship.[2]

The Arabian Histories and Tatian's *Diatessaron* are still nearer the home of the Old Testament and are even more pertinent for our enquiry.

The Arabian Histories were frequently compiled from older sources, one serving as the chief framework of the new history, while into it were introduced passages from other sources, whether contradictory of it or merely supplementary. For example, "particularly in the later Arabic historians, we come upon what may be called patch-work narratives, consisting of short passages borrowed (with or without modification) from older works and fitted together by the compiler, who, of course, usually intersperses remarks of his own."[3] Here, again, it is a case not of conjecture, but of ascertained fact illuminated by an abundance of evidence.

[1] See *The Cambridge History of English Literature*, vol i., 1907, pp. 46 f.; for this and for a brief comparison of the *Historia Miscella* and the lives of St. Francis of Assisi with the Pentateuch in respect of composite authorship, *cf.* the Rev. P. H. Wicksteed, in *The Inquirer*, Jan. 26, 1901, pp. 51 f. Not without interest, especially for comparison with some of the Pentateuchal legislation, is Justinian's use of the *Institutes* of Gaius, from which he incorporated large sections; see Dr. T. E. Holland's edition, in which the incorporated passages are printed in heavy type.

[2] See Carpenter and Harford, *op. cit.*, pp. 10–12.

[3] See A. A. Bevan, *Historical Methods in the Old Testament*, Essay I. in *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, 1909, where instances are quoted; also Professor Guidi, *Revue Biblique*, 1906, pp. 509–19.

The *Diatessaron* emanated from the Semitic circles of Christian Syria, and it was in Semitic lands, too, that it had its greatest currency. Hence it evidently coincided with the general literary ideals of the Semites, and is therefore, like the Arabian Histories, valuable as showing us what we may expect in the Old Testament. It was composed to serve as a harmony of the Gospels. Its aim was attained, in the case of each narrative recorded in more than one Gospel, by the choice of sections, verses or half verses from each of those Gospels which related it.

Take, for instance, Tatian's harmony of the only miracle recorded by all four evangelists, the Feeding of the Five Thousand. The opening sections illustrate the methods he employed throughout. We notice, too, how the *latest* of all the four Gospels often becomes the *ground-work* into which are woven extracts from the other three, while Tatian by a phrase inserted here and there cleverly combines and redacts the whole.

Mk. vi. 33a "And many saw them going, and knew them, and hastened by land from all the cities,
Jn. vi. 2b-5a and came thither beforehand; | for they saw the signs which he was doing on the sick. And Jesus went up into the mountain, and sat there with his disciples. And the feast of the passover of the Jews was near. And Jesus lifted up his eyes, and saw great multitudes coming
Mk. vi. 34b to him. | And he was moved with compassion for them, for they were like sheep that *were*
Lk. ix. 11b without a shepherd. | And he received them, and spake to them concerning the kingdom of God, and healed those who had need of healing.
Mt. xiv. 15a | And when the evening approached, his disciples came to him, and said unto him, The place is desert, and the time is passed; send away the
Mk. vi. 36 multitudes of the people, | that they may go to the towns and villages which are around us,

and buy for themselves bread; for they have
Mt. xiv. 16-17a nothing to eat. | But he said unto them, They have no need to go away; give ye them what may be eaten. They said unto him, We have
Jn. vi. 5b-9 not here *enough*. | He said unto Philip, Whence shall we buy bread that these may eat? And he said that proving him; and he knew what he was resolved to do. Philip said unto him, Two hundred pennyworth of bread would not suffice them after every one of them hath taken a small amount. One of his disciples said unto him (namely, Andrew the brother of Simon Cephas), Here is a lad having five loaves of barley and two fishes: but this amount, what
Lk. ix. 13b is it for all these? | But wilt thou that we go and buy for all the people what may be eaten? for we have no more than these five loaves
Jn. vi. 10b and a few fishes. | And the grass was plentiful
Lk. ix. 14b-15a in that place. | Jesus said unto them, Arrange all the people that they may sit down on the grass, fifty people in a company. And the
Mk. vi. 40. disciples did so. | And all the people sat down by companies, by hundreds and fifties." [1]

The reader should consult the *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, additional volume, in which Tatian's *Diatessaron* is given in full with the sources indicated in the margin, and from which the above extract has been taken.

But in the pages of the Old Testament itself numerous instances occur of differences in literary style and point of view, from which differences of authorship may be inferred. In several cases some of the sources to which the alternations in style point still survive in a separate form to prove the correctness of our statement. The case of Chronicles, written well within the post-Exilic period, is beyond dispute. At times there are apparent, especially to the student of Hebrew, peculiar mannerisms of vocabulary, syntax, and style, different from those

[1] Section xviii. 22–38.

which appear in the context. The reader will best realise the full significance of this if he will underline in his Bible these sections of 1 and 2 Chronicles in which such peculiarities appear, utilising for this purpose the full list of stylistic and other characteristics in Dr. Driver's *Introduction*, pp. 535–40. These sections will then be found to contain statistical matter (such as genealogies, lists of names, *etc.*); matter regulative of the Temple and other public worship, ceremonies, officials and their duties; matter pointing the moral of the various events of the past in relation to their causes or their results, often found in the mouths of the numerous prophets, and frequently directed against the monarchs who controlled the nation's fortunes at these various epochs. Now when we look at the very considerable residuum left after the removal of the sections in question and compare it with the books of Samuel and Kings, we find that, for the period covered by these latter, it is they which have furnished the Chronicler with the ancient material that differs so radically from his own strongly marked contributions. In them occur none of the phenomena of style, contents, or representation, that occur in those parts of 1 and 2 Chronicles which the reader has already underlined. Often whole sections have been transferred bodily, and absolutely *verbatim*, to the Chronicler's narrative; at times slight modifications are introduced into this borrowed matter; at times additions are made to it—*by means of sentences, verses, and groups of verses*, marked by the characteristics of style, contents, and representation to which we have already referred.

The following brief extract, of an ecclesiastical character, illustrates this :—

1 Kings iii.	2 Chron. i.
4. And the king	3. And Solomon, and all the congregation with him,
went to Gibeon to sacrifice there; for that was the great high-place:	went to the high place that was at Gibeon; for there was the tent of meeting of of God, which Moses the servant of the Lord had made in the wilderness.
	4. But the ark of God had David brought up from Kirjath-jearim to *the place* that David had prepared for it: for he had pitched a tent for it at
	5. Jerusalem. Moreover the brasen altar, that Bezalel the son of Uri, the son of Hur, had made, was there before the tabernacle of the Lord: and Solomon and the congregation
	6. sought unto it. And Solomon went up thither to the brasen altar before the Lord, which was at the tent of meeting, and he did offer upon it a thousand burnt offerings.
a thousand burnt-offerings used Solomon to offer upon that	
5. altar. In Gibeon the Lord appeared to Solomon in a dream by night: and God said, Ask what I shall give thee.	7. In that night God appeared to Solomon, and said unto him, Ask what I shall give thee.

Or, again, notice the following passage in which the narrative element predominates, and which also illustrates the appearance of the prophetic warning in the book of Chronicles.[1]

[1] See further instances in G. Buchanan Gray, *A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament*, 1913, pp. 8–11; on the Chronicler's methods see chap. x. of the same work, and *cf.* p. 140, *n.* 3 of the present book.

2 KINGS XIV.

5. And it came to pass, when the kingdom was established in his hand, that he slew his servants which had slain the king
6. his father. But the children of the murderers he put not to death: according to that which is written in the book of the law of Moses, as the LORD commanded, saying, The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, nor the children be put to death for the fathers; but every man shall die for his own sin.

2 CHRON. XXV.

3. And it came to pass when the kingdom was established unto him, that he killed his servants which had slain the king
4. his father. But their children he put not to death, but [he did] according to that which is written in the law in the book of Moses, as the LORD commanded, saying, The fathers shall not die for the children, nor the children die for the fathers; but every man shall die for
5. his own sin. Moreover Amaziah gathered Judah together and set them according to their fathers' houses, under captains of thousands and captains of hundreds, even all Judah and Benjamin: and he numbered them from twenty years old and upward, and found them three hundred thousand chosen men, able to go forth to war, that could handle spear and
6. shield. He hired also an hundred thousand mighty men of valour out of Israel for an hundred
7. talents of silver. But there came a man of God to him, saying, O king, let not the army of Israel

2 KINGS XIV.

7. He smote of Edom in the Valley of Salt

ten thousand, and took Sela by war, and called the name of it Joktheel, unto this day.

2 CHRON. XXV.

go with thee: for the LORD is not with Israel, *to wit*, with all the chil-
8. dren of Ephraim. But if thou wilt go, do *valiantly*, be strong for the battle: God shall cast thee down before the enemy; for God hath power to help, and to
9. cast down. And Amaziah said to the man of God, But what shall we do for the hundred talents which I have given to the army of Israel? And the man of God answered, The LORD is able to give thee much more than this.
10. Then Amaziah separated them, *to wit*, the army that was come to him out of Ephraim, to go home again: wherefore their anger was greatly kindled against Judah, and they returned home in fierce
11. anger. And Amaziah took courage, and led forth his people, and went to the Valley of Salt, and smote of the children of Seir ten thousand.

12. And ten thousand did the children of Judah carry away alive, and brought them unto the top of the rock[1] and

[1] R.V. marg., *Sela*.

2 Kings xiv.	2 Chron. xxv.
	cast them down from the top of the rock, that they all were broken in pieces.
	13. But the men of the army which Amaziah sent back, that they should not go with him to battle, fell upon the cities of Judah, from Samaria even unto Beth-horon, and smote of them three thousand, and took much spoil. [*Vv.* 14-16 *narrate how another prophet announces the divine anger at their apostasy.*]
8. Then Amaziah sent messengers to Jehoash, the son of Jehoahaz son of Jehu, king of Israel, saying, Come, let us look one another in the	17. Then Amaziah king of Judah took advice, and sent
9. face. And Jehoash king of Israel sent to Amaziah king of Judah, saying, The thistle that was in Lebanon sent to the cedar that was in Lebanon, saying, *etc.*	17. to Joash, the son of Jehoahaz, son of Jehu, king of Israel, saying, Come, let us look one another in the 18. face. And Joash king of Israel sent to Amaziah king of Judah, saying, The thistle that was in Lebanon sent to the cedar that was in Lebanon, saying, *etc.*

Again, in Ezra and Nehemiah, the co-existence of (*a*) sections dating from a period long subsequent to that of Ezra and Nehemiah, along with (*b*) sections from the actual memoirs of these two leaders, the practical identity of the style of the former with that of the Chronicler and the greater originality and energy of the latter, the outcome of the writer's vigorous personality, the change, in even immediately contiguous sections, from the first to the third person, the unevenness in the treatment of

the history, the repetition at times of the same matter —all these combine to point to the use of sources.

One is surprised, therefore, to find Professor Sayce on p. v of his Preface to the English translation of J. Dahse, *Is a Revolution in Pentateuchal Criticism at Hand?*, 1912, writing as follows: "Long ago I challenged the critics to tell us what belonged to Rice and what to Besant, or what to Erckmann and what to Chatrian, in works which we know to have been written conjointly and by two authors only—not half a dozen; but the challenge has very wisely never been taken up." Surely there is a glaring fallacy here. But first let us take up Professor Sayce's challenge with regard to the first pair. The following extract from a letter of Mr. F. A. B. Rice, which I include here with his permission, perhaps answers the question, and incidentally shows that the Professor has mistaken the sense in which the two authors wrote their work 'conjointly': "The work of one hand can *not* be traced and distinguished from the work of the other. For both plot and narrative were the result of much meeting and many talks; as the printed page meets the eye it is always the result of collaboration reduced to a science, of each partner's carefully 'working over' the other's share. It was emphatically not the case that each wrote a section of the story. A comparison of any of Besant's novels written independently, and after my father's death, will show pretty well what qualities Besant lacked and what was my father's special contribution to the partnership." This surely is a complete answer to Professor Sayce's challenge. It shows conclusively both that Besant and Rice's novels are *not* constructed in the way in which critics suppose the historical Books of the Old Testament to have been constructed, and also explains why we cannot expect

ever to be able to separate the contributions of Besant and Rice from each other. But even supposing that the facts had not been known, and that the authors had independently written different sections of the novels, but that no difference of style could be detected between such sections, it obviously does not follow that because we cannot distinguish the respective contributions of two authors who—whether by agreement or inadvertently—write *in the same style*, we cannot distinguish their contributions when *their styles are different*. Add to this the fact that each of these different styles is generally, in the case of the Biblical writers, accompanied by a difference of point of view, and a foundation of cumulative evidence is laid which it is idle to suppose such a transparent fallacy as this of Professor Sayce could damage, still less destroy.

The following pages will show that there are problems of this nature in the Pentateuch. In spite of all obstacles and difficulties and misrepresentations, every lover of truth, if properly equipped for the venture, must carefully examine and re-examine both the problems themselves and the solution propounded by the great majority of scholars of the past and of to-day.

CHAPTER II

THE HISTORY OF PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM

For many centuries the whole Pentateuch was almost[1] universally regarded as the work of Moses. In the Middle Ages the Rabbi Isaac ben Jasos († 1057) and the better known Rabbi Abraham Ibn Ezra († 1167) seem to have stood alone in their expression of some considerable doubt as to whether such passages as Gen. xii. 6, xxxvi. 31, or Deut. i. 1 did not entail the supposition that a number of glosses and interpolations had found their way into the Mosaic Pentateuch.[2] This procedure, by which now one verse, now another, is isolated and finally omitted as being non-Mosaic, naturally goes some way towards answering one or two of the more apparent and superficial difficulties recognised at that time with regard to the Mosaic authorship. But simply to erase the words "At that time the Canaanite was still in the land," or the narrative of the death of Moses, or various other remarks confessedly impossible in the mouth of a writer of Moses' own time,[3] fails completely, as will before long appear,

[1] For the doubts as to the Mosaic authorship expressed in the earliest Christian centuries see C. Steuernagel, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 1912, pp. 126 f.

[2] Even Spinoza made little real advance upon the surmises which these scholars had so cautiously expressed.

[3] Such passages in the Pentateuch and Joshua, the number and extent of which is remarkable, are classified and enumerated in A. T. Chapman, *An Introduction to the Pentateuch*, 1911, pp. 41 ff. From the writings of a number of even ultra-conservative apologists for the

to meet the circumstances of the case. The fundamental difficulties still remain unsolved, and are only reinforced by the multitudinous gaps resulting from the process. Even as early as 1520, Andreas Bodenstein of Rarestadt,[1] while admitting the Law to be Mosaic, was driven to enquire whether the thread of the narratives could have come from Moses himself. For instance, Moses certainly did not write the record of his own death (Deut. xxxiv. 5, 6); and yet, as Bodenstein pointed out, *this last narrative of the Pentateuch is marked by the same literary style and phraseology as that which characterises the several sections immediately preceding it!* Further, this naïve recourse to the hypothesis of isolated glosses and interpolations, apart from its failure to grapple with the literary characteristics of the Pentateuch, has no solution to offer with regard to the duplications and repetitions, both of narratives and of laws, which are evident even to the casual reader.

It was Richard Simon, an Oratorian priest, who, in the third quarter of the seventeenth century, rejecting this hypothesis,[2] was the first to argue on scientific lines that, when (*a*) the same event is narrated twice, and when (*b*) such duplication is accompanied by a diversity of style, this phenomenon must be due to the work of two different narrators. If with the common sense

antiquity of the Pentateuch one might think that this point was universally conceded; but Troelstra, for instance, though on p. 20 of the English translation (see below p. 95) he concedes this and more, yet on p. 34 emphasises as "of special importance" a quotation from a book published as recently as 1911—"the Pentateuch must have been finished on the plain of Moab before the Promised Land was entered"! Even Dr. Orr, in his Introduction to the book from which Troelstra quotes these words, is constrained to withhold his approval from some of the conclusions enunciated in it.

[1] In his *Libellus de Canonicis Scripturis*, published at Wittenberg.

[2] See Carpenter and Harford, *op. cit.*, pp. 38 ff.

which Simon thus displays he had united a careful examination of the linguistic and stylistic peculiarities of these doublets throughout the Pentateuch instead of only in Genesis, he might well have been awarded the title of "the founder of modern Biblical Criticism," which he richly deserved.

Unfortunately neither Simon's Church nor his century could produce such a combination of literary and historical acumen, and if such a combination had been produced, the Church at least might not have appreciated it. Between 1678, when Simon published his *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament*,[1] and the middle of the next century no progress was made. Simon's work was speedily forgotten, if indeed it ever received much attention. Even to-day the fact that Simon anticipated some of the results of many later scholars' work is so far from being generally recognised that a Paris physician, by name Jean Astruc, is commonly supposed to be the founder of the critical study of the Old Testament, the first critic.[2] If one judged solely from the writings of some authors whose aim is to discredit the ascertained facts of Pentateuchal criticism, one would suppose that Astruc was not only the first of the great critics but also the last, that all scholars of the last or of the present generation—good and bad alike—who do not denounce the whole trend of literary and historical criticism, are but his puny disciples, reiterating his arguments without addition, and still in the crude and faulty form in which he published them in 1753.[3] For instance, Dr. A. Troelstra published in 1912 a brief study entitled *De*

[1] Translated into English in 1682.

[2] Chapman, *op cit.*, pp. 27 f., however, rightly places these writers in their true relation to each other.

[3] In his work entitled *Conjectures sur les memoires originaux dont il paroit que Moyse s'est servi pour composer le livre de la Genèse.*

Naam Gods in den Pentateuch, which was translated into English in the same year under the auspices of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. On the title-page of this English translation, in addition to *The Name of God in the Pentateuch* (which is the only title in the Dutch original) there stands, apparently as an alternative heading, *The Base of Biblical Criticism re-examined*![1] But to examine either the use of the names of God in the Pentateuch or Astruc's deductions from their alternations in Genesis, or to do both these things, is not to re-examine 'the *base* of Biblical criticism' or to attack it "in its very foundations."[2] Astruc's work, it is true, may be described, at least if Simon is to be ignored, as the *starting-point* of the literary and historical discrimination of the documents of the Pentateuch and of their assignation to their respective ages. But the implication that Astruc's hypothesis constitutes the 'base,' or foundation, of the critical view of the structure and growth of the Pentateuch, as it is now taught by those who hold it, is a very different thing, and in fact altogether false; for it entirely ignores all the many and important facts to which attention has been called since Astruc wrote, but which he left unnoticed, and which, in their entirety, constitute the true 'base' of the Pentateuchal criticism of the present day.

What then was Astruc's position? It seems to have

[1] It should also be noted that in the Dutch edition Dr. Troelstra styles himself *Predikant bij de Herv. Gem. te 's-Gravenhage* (*i.e.* Minister of the Reformed Church at the Hague), a description which is omitted in the S.P.C.K. translation. This omission, in conjunction with the statement in the Preface that the lectures were delivered in the University of Leiden, seems to have led to the inference (see *The Record*, Nov. 29, 1912, p. 1129) that Troelstra is Kuenen's successor at Leiden. This is a mistake; Eerdmans is Kuenen's successor.

[2] As Mr. McClure claims on p. iii of his Preface to this translation of Troelstra!

been largely influenced by apologetic considerations: his purpose was to answer the objections, based on the doublets, repetitions, and lack of continuity of narration in Genesis, which were being brought against the traditional belief that Moses wrote it.[1] Hence he developed the hypothesis that Moses utilised for this book several older stories which at times agreed with, and at times contradicted, one another. He urged that Moses had compared and arranged his two chief sources and several auxiliary ones in four columns, but that later copyists had, in a very superficial and mechanical manner, transformed these columns into one continuous text. Astruc allotted to the first of his chief sources all those narratives which consistently used the word *God* (Hebrew *'Elōhīm*) when the deity either spoke or was referred to; to his second chief source he assigned all those narratives in which the word LORD[2] was consistently used. This was practically Astruc's sole criterion. It was a starting-point of modern criticism; but it is not, and never has been, the 'base' of any 'critical' theory generally recognised by any 'critics' alive to-day.[3] To be sure Eichhorn in 1780–3, in his *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*,

[1] *Cf.* C. Steuernagel, *op. cit.*, p. 127.

[2] *i.e.* יהוה (properly to be vocalised *Jahveh* and to be pronounced *Yahweh*), which in the Revised Version *always* (except in the few cases in which Jehovah is retained, and in the combination *'ădōnāy J-hv-h*, which is represented by 'the Lord GOD') appears as 'the LORD.' Anyone can notice in his R.V. how, *e.g.*, in Gen. i.–ii. 4a *God* (*'Elōhīm*) is consistently used, while in ii. 4b–iv. the LORD (Jehovah) makes its appearance. To prevent misunderstanding, it should be explained that it is *'Elōhīm* standing *by itself* which is characteristic of particular sources; 'God,' with a possessive pronoun or a genitive (*my, thy, God, etc.*; *God of . . .*), is used constantly by all the Pentateuchal writers.

[3] "It would be quite a delusion to suppose that the theory that the narrative of the Pentateuch is not a simple narrative, but that it is throughout compiled from more than one previously existing document, rests merely, or even principally, on the differing use of the divine

published conclusions of his own, very similar to Astruc's in method and result, though to a great extent worked out quite independently of that scholar.[1] It should be remembered, however, that although the alternation of the Divine name was Eichhorn's main criterion, yet, as for instance in the account of the Flood, he also noted the concomitant alternation of sets of expressions.

Eichhorn had at that time a vogue far and wide, unsurpassed in later times even by that of an Ewald in Germany or a Dean Stanley in England. But in spite of Eichhorn's fame, this elementary and experimental hypothesis was destined soon to yield to theories which took into account as primary criteria other and more important phenomena than the mere alternation of the Divine names. Now this latter phenomenon *might* hold good as a reliable criterion in Genesis i.–xix., even if it were consistently unaccompanied by other criteria. But even so it was a sorry guide, so long as it stood virtually alone; a copyist might have unconsciously substituted one name for the other (a contingency which, however, is no longer fatal when other criteria have been discovered); verses in which neither occurred could not be classified; in Gen. ii. 4^b ff. both names occur together; and once or twice the document, otherwise uniformly using LORD (Jehovah), might conceivably be compelled to use *God* (*'Elōhīm*) for some special purpose. But further, it failed to reveal the distinction of authorship *within* the sections in chs. xx.–l. in which *God* (*'Elōhīm*) appears, a distinction which was only

names. The theory that different documents are incorporated in the Pentateuch rests on a vastly wider basis." G. Buchanan Gray, *op. cit.*, p. 20 (*cf.* also pp. 29 f.).

[1] *Cf.* T. K. Cheyne, *Founders of Old Testament Criticism*, 1893, p. 23. Steuernagel remarks "it is at any rate doubtful whether he knew Astruc otherwise than from his opponents' writings."

established—by Hupfeld[1]—exactly a hundred years after Astruc published his work. Moreover, the alternation of LORD (Jehovah) and *God* (*'Elōhīm*), though it so far distinguishes all the narratives using *God* (*'Elōhīm*), if not from each other, at least from that employing LORD (Jehovah), fails after Ex. vi. 3 as a real clue in any true sense of the word; for henceforth all the sources use LORD (Jehovah) more frequently than *God* (*'Elōhīm*).[2] And yet, as we shall see, there are grounds as strong for holding the Pentateuch to be composite *after* Ex. vi. as for holding it to be so *before* it. This again demonstrates how distinct the criticism of to-day is from that of Astruc's hypothesis. Astruc did not even claim to deal with more than Gen. i.–Ex. vi.; the 'critic' of to-day, on the other hand, stands or falls by his ability or inability to give a reasonable and inherently self-consistent explanation of the phenomena supplied by the Pentateuch[3] as a whole.

Consequently Astruc's early 'documentary-theory,' as it has been called, gave way to the 'fragmentary hypothesis.' The latter owed its origin to a Scotchman, Alexander Geddes, born in Banffshire in 1737, of Roman Catholic parentage, and educated at the Scotch College at Paris.[4] This hypothesis, of the British origin of which

[1] In his *Die Quellen der Genesis und die Art ihrer Zusammensetzung*, 1853.

[2] *Cf.* pp. 55-8, 72-4, 177.

[3] And indeed, properly speaking, of the Hexateuch (=the Pentateuch + Joshua): but the present work, as its title indicates, is concerned only with the first five books of the Old Testament. Hence, except in the Appendix to Chapter III., the criticism of Joshua is not taken into account; upon it the reader should consult the various *Introductions* to the literature of the Old Testament, such as that by Dr. Driver or the shorter one by Dr. Buchanan Gray.

[4] He published his hypothesis in *The Holy Bible*, i., 1792; *Critical Remarks on the Hebrew*, i., 1800.

we should be proud, was introduced into Germany by Vater in his *Commentar über den Pentateuch*, 1802–5. It successfully emphasised one of the many aspects of the problem which Astruc and Eichhorn had failed to grasp, viz. the variety and non-coherence of the various sections which go to make up the Pentateuch. Moreover, it also had the following merits: (1) it extended the field of investigation from Genesis to the whole Pentateuch; (2) it left it no longer improbable that Moses was not the author of the whole Pentateuch; and (3) it showed that each of the several traditions had a history of its own and went through various stages of growth.

It is at this point that Ewald contributes his share to the rise of scientific Old Testament criticism. Ewald, it should be remembered, was a great scholar—great as a grammarian, great as an exegete, great as a historian.[1] In his *Die Komposition der Genesis kritisch untersucht*, 1823, he pointed out an essential weakness in the 'fragmentary' hypothesis. While it had done excellent service in emphasising the *diversity of origin* of the various parts of Genesis, it had been wrong in denying the *unity of the plan* on which the whole is arranged. Ewald thus made a positive contribution to the solution of our problem by the clearness with which he demonstrated the unmistakable existence throughout the Pentateuch of documents originally distinct but now unified. A still more definitely progressive contribution was made by the same scholar when, partially retracting the position he had previously taken up, he adopted what is generally

[1] Dean Stanley, for instance, frankly recognised his own indebtedness to Ewald in his *History of the Jewish Church* (compare also especially p. vi of Russell Martineau's *Preface* to Vol. I. of his translation of Ewald's *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (ed. 1, 1843; ed. 3, 1864); also for Ewald's friendship for Stanley see *Life of Max Müller*, 1902, vol. i., p. 296).

known as the 'supplementary hypothesis.'[1] According to this, an Elohistic document (*i.e.* one in which God is designated by *'Elōhīm*, in this case what we now term the 'Grundschrift' or 'Priestly' document) commencing at Gen. i. 1, was supplemented by a later writer, the Jahvist (*i.e.* the writer who, in contradistinction, uses Jahveh, or Jehovah, 'the LORD'), by the addition of a number of sections and notices not organically connected together. Now some passages, it is true, might seem to afford support for this theory. For instance, the words of Noah's father in Gen. v. 29 (assigned to the Jahvist), appear in the midst of a section in which not LORD (Jehovah) but *God* (*'Elōhīm*) is the predominant method of denoting the Deity. The lengthier sections in which LORD (Jehovah) appears, on the other hand, emphatically demonstrate that these 'Jahvistic' sections were once an independent, self-consistent, and coherent work. Occasionally, moreover, the Jahvistic document is clearly 'supplemented' by the 'Priestly' document.[2] It is unnecessary here to go into further details, or to give Ewald's somewhat complicated terminology and dating of the sources involved in his treatment of the problem.[3]

We must now turn to the last phase in the eventful evolution of Pentateuchal criticism. If the reader's imagination can be stirred in the least by the thought of Simon's or Astruc's almost romantic isolation amid the prevailing ignorance, he will appreciate the pathos of the silent, though none the less real, triumph achieved by Eduard Reuss (1804–91) in the year 1834, when he

[1] The chief advocates of this were J. J. Stähelin (1797–1875), Friedrich Bleek (1793–1859), and Friedrich Tuch (1806–67).

[2] *E.g.* Gen. xix. 29 might be cited.

[3] They may be found most conveniently in Carpenter and Harford, *op. cit.*, pp. 77–9.

"narrowly missed becoming a hero of Old Testament Criticism." In the preface to his *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften Alten Testaments*, published long afterwards in 1881, Reuss tells how the truth came to him by a kind of intuition. But though he did not publish it till others had led the way,[1] he explained his theories in his lecture-room. Two pupils heard and appreciated. One was A. Kayser (1821–85), who reproduced his master's conclusions in 1874 in his *Das vorexilische Buch der Urgeschichte*. The other was K. H. Graf (1815–69),[2] who first published his conclusions in 1865–6, and after whom the hypothesis with all that it involves has—for some reasons unfortunately—been termed the 'Grafian hypothesis.' The two earliest and most distinguished exponents of Graf's thesis were A. Kuenen (1828–91)[3] and Julius Wellhausen. The former was no inexperienced scholar when he adopted the new position; while the latter, by his more comprehensive treatment of the problem, and the broader and firmer basis on which he

[1] *E.g.* the principle involved was independently stated in the year following Reuss's discovery by W. Vatke, Leopold George, and Von Bohlen. But as early as 1805 De Wette (who was also the first to identify Deuteronomy with Josiah's law-book), when only twenty-five years of age, had pointed out the 'development' in the laws of worship.

[2] That Graf himself fully realised the debt he owed to Reuss is shown by his letter written to the latter on Dec. 10th, 1865, on the eve of the publication of his book, and included by K. Budde and H. J. Holtzmann in *Eduard Reuss, Briefwechsel mit seinem Schüler und Freunde Karl Heinrich Graf*, Giessen, 1904, published on the occasion of the centenary celebration of Reuss's birth.

[3] Especially in *De Godsdienst van Israel*, 1869–70. In the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, June, 1892, the Rev. P. H. Wicksteed has written a sketch of Kuenen's life, which brings to light the beautiful elements in it that are apt to be forgotten by those who would challenge his conclusions; *cf.* also T. K. Cheyne, *op. cit.*, pp. 185–94, and Wellhausen's tribute on p. 11 of his *Prolegomena*.

placed the theory, to borrow Pfleiderer's words, "removed Old Testament Criticism from the rank of a subordinate question to the centre of theological discussion."[1]

Since that time, in the British Empire, in America as well as on the Continent, both in Protestant and in Catholic circles, the question has been debated independently, and there have often been expressed at the outset strong *a priori* prejudices against, but, in the end, in most cases whole-hearted agreement with, the solution to which the foregoing pages lead us.[2] And this solution—so gradually evolved in God's Providence, so carefully developed by scholar after scholar in the past, and so reverently expounded by numbers to-day—offers not merely the only logical and satisfactory explanation of the phenomena of the Old Testament, but also one of the greatest and yet the simplest helps to all who would find in our Lord the goal of all development, the answer to their intellectual as well as their devotional aspirations.[3]

With the evidence which leads unmistakably to this

[1] In 1876 Wellhausen published his famous essays on the composition of the Hexateuch, followed by his *Geschichte Israels*, vol. i., in 1878, republished in 1883 and 1905 under the title *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*. The English translation, with a Preface by the great Scotch pioneer of Biblical criticism, W. Robertson Smith, closes with a reprint of Wellhausen's article in the 9th edition of the *Enc. Brit.* on the *History of Israel and Judah* (which is also published separately), and a translation of his article *Israel*.

[2] See the remarkable list of scholars quoted by Briggs, *The Higher Criticism*, 1893, pp. 143 f. Dean Farrar wrote in 1893: "There is scarcely a competent scholar who does not now admit that the Hexateuch is a composite structure; that much of the Levitical legislation, which was once called Mosaic, is in reality an after-growth which *in its present form* is not earlier than the days of the prophet Ezekiel; that the Book of Deuteronomy belongs, in its present form, whatever older elements it may contain, to the era of Hezekiah's or Josiah's reformation."

[3] See Ch. VII., below.

solution, and with the positive constructive results which follow from it, the succeeding chapters will deal at as great length as space will allow. Here it must suffice to point out :—

I. The results in brief. We find in the Pentateuch (*a*) a combination of two strands of ancient Mosaic tradition, and even legislation, usually denoted by the symbol JE, much of which can be separated into what is peculiar to J and E respectively ; (*b*) the Deuteronomic legislation (Deut. xii.–xxvi.) belonging to Josiah's reformation, and mostly based, where it differs fundamentally from JE, on the teaching of the eighth-century prophets ; and (*c*) the so-called 'Priestly' narratives and legislation (including the Code of Holiness in Lev. xvii.–xxvi.), clearly and definitely distinguishable in every way from JE as well as from D, and usually denoted by the symbol P, the product, in its present form, of the Exilic, or early post-Exilic, period, and presupposing the teaching of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Deutero-Isaiah.

II. These results follow from the discriminating examination of (*a*) the various literary, stylistic, and other characteristics of the several different sources which appear in the Pentateuch ; (*b*) the different religious standpoints reflected in the various sources ; *e.g.* one simple and primitive, another considerably more developed, and a third the climax of the whole ; (*c*) the historical background which each of these sources presupposes and demands, and their coincidence with certain great epochs in the religious development of the Hebrew nation ; and (*d*) the light shed by the Old Testament, on 'the critical hypothesis,' upon the manner in which the purpose of God in His choice of the Hebrew people to be the channel of His preparation for the Incarnation was progressively worked out.

These are the grounds upon which all discrimination of Pentateuchal problems must proceed. If any objections are raised against our results, the objector must show wherein the premises are wrong in the case of each of these independent lines of argument sketched above. But our present opponents will not join issue on these several points. They prefer to argue as though the alternation of LORD (Jehovah) and *God* (*'Elōhīm*) were the 'base' of our position—and the *only* one. Enough has been said to show that the latter was practically the *sole* criterion *only in the case of Astruc*; that, as far as the 'critic' of the present day is concerned, it is only a very subordinate one among many more important evidences of the distinction of authorship in the case of JE and P. Supposing it were proved to be of little value at the present day, it would only be like, as it were, the tiny fragment of auriferous ore which suggests to the prospector the presence of rich seams beneath the surface; when once these have been opened up in all their wealth and promise, it matters little to subsequent generations whether that particular fragment itself yielded much or little of the precious metal. Can anything be more unfair than to quote the older pioneers—and in this case only one—against more recent critics? And yet this is constantly done![1]

In every science there is progress as investigation is extended. In what science is not much more known now than was known in 1753? In what branch of knowledge have not the first immature conclusions of a century and a half ago since been modified and corrected? Take chemistry for instance: Sir Henry Roscoe has pointed out that much has been revolutionised since

[1] Among many others by Dr. J. Orr, *The Problem of the Old Testament*, 1906 (*e.g.* pp. 204 f., 211 f.); Dahse, *op. cit.*, pp. 16 f.

he first began to produce his famous works on Chemistry.[1] Are scientists such as he discredited because, since they first began the systematic study of their subject, they have advanced their knowledge of it, and on some points have corrected the views which they had originally expressed? Why, then, is an exception made by the handful of our opponents in the case of *Biblical* study? This chapter has shown by what painful and plodding steps such lovers of truth, in many nations, have striven each to reach nearer the goal than his predecessors. From the first gropings of a Simon or an Astruc or an Eichhorn, through the labours of many another, of the majority of whom space has allowed no mention in this chapter, the present generation of critics, though to a great extent working independently of each other, have arrived at a remarkable consensus of opinion on the main issues.

NOTE ON THE BEARING OF ARCHÆOLOGY ON THE CRITICISM OF THE PENTATEUCH

On the 'higher' criticism of the Pentateuch Archæology has little or no bearing. No Israelite, or ancestor of the Israelites, named in the Pentateuch is mentioned in the Inscriptions[2]; tribes, countries, and certain foreign kings

[1] Thus in a Preface, written in August 1900, to one of the many editions of his *Lessons in Elementary Chemistry* he wrote: "More than thirty years have elapsed since these lessons were first published. During that period, the progress which the Science of Chemistry has made, both as regards the subject matter and the method of its treatment, has been so great as to constitute a revolution. Consequently, a frequent reconstruction more or less complete of the lessons has been a necessity. In the present Edition, wholly reprinted, care has been taken, whilst preserving as far as possible the original scope and treatment of the subject, to bring the whole up to the level of the science of to-day."

[2] The fact that, in the list of places in Palestine captured by Shishak, *c.* B.C. 930, one of them (No. 71-2) is held by Egyptologists (see, *e.g.*,

are mentioned in them, but not in such a way as to throw light on the date of the Pentateuchal documents in which they are named. Nor in other respects is the critical view of the Pentateuch in any way in conflict with archæological discovery. Attempts have indeed been made to show that the contrary is the case; but, when examined, it will be found that, for one reason or another, all fail. Some rest on misconceptions of what either the arguments or the conclusions of critics really are, so that what is refuted by Archæology is not really the critical position at all; others are inconclusive on other grounds.

It has been declared, for instance, with great positiveness, that the discovery of the *Tel-el-Amarna* letters has overthrown the conclusions of criticism, since they are based on the assumption that Moses could not write. But no statement to this effect by any critic is known to the present writer; and critics do not as a fact rest their conclusions on this assumption at all. They are well aware that, at least among some peoples, especially the Egyptians and the Babylonians—there is no monumental evidence with regard to the Hebrews—writing was practised long before the age of Moses. To be sure it does not necessarily follow that, because writing is practised in one nation, it is therefore practised at the same time in another nation; but critics are not concerned to press this objection. They do not deny that Moses *could* have written a book even longer than the Pentateuch; what they deny is that the *existing Pentateuch* is his work. They deny this on account of a mass of *internal* evidence which will be outlined in the following chapters, and which shows conclusively that the Pentateuch cannot be the work of a single man, or of a single age; and the fact that writing was known either in or before the age of Moses has obviously no bearing whatever upon this question.

Again, it has been alleged that, to quote Professor Sayce, "the discovery of the code of Khammu-rabi has disproved"

Breasted, *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, vol. xxi. p. 36, or *History of Egypt*, p. 530) to correspond to a Semitic phrase *ḥaḳal 'Abram*, 'field of Abram,' obviously has no bearing on the date of the Pentateuchal documents in which Abraham is mentioned. If the critical hypothesis is correct, the mention of the patriarch's name in Shishak's list—if indeed the reference in this phrase is to the patriarch—will be the earliest reference to him of which we have at present any knowledge.

the critics' denial "that a legal code was possible before the period of the Jewish kings." Professor Sayce does not state who the critics are who make this denial, or where this denial is to be found; but, if the words are rightly attributed to them, they can hardly mean anything except that the Hebrews before the monarchy had not reached a stage of civilisation at which they were adapted to receive a code. Critics may be wrong in this supposition: but, if so, they certainly cannot be refuted by the Code of Ḥammurabi. Codes of laws are unknown till a nation has reached a fairly mature stage of civilisation: Babylon had reached such maturity long before Israel—or, for the matter of that, before Athens or Rome; and so, about 2100 B.C., this body of Babylonian laws was codified by Ḥammurabi. But how this fact could prove that another nation, living under different conditions, was fitted to receive a code of law at a particular time, it is impossible to understand: this depends upon the stage of civilisation which the nation in question had reached at the time in question, not upon the fact that a code had been drawn up earlier in another country. The argument is thus simply a *non sequitur*.

Again, another serious misunderstanding of the facts is disclosed in Professor Sayce's further statement that Assyriological discovery, such as that of this same Code of Ḥammurabi, "has for ever shattered the 'critical' theory which would put the prophets before the law." This confident assertion, however, will not bear examination. In the first place, when critics are said to place "the prophets before the law," what is meant is the *priestly* law, the ceremonial regulations of P, which bulk so largely in the Pentateuch, and which give it its predominant character: no critic doubts that the laws of JE are earlier than the prophets.[1] But, in the second place, it is not apparent how, even if there were resemblances between P and the Code of Ḥammurabi, they would show that P existed before the prophets; for we do not *know* when or how the influence of the Code first made itself felt among the Hebrews, and these resemblances might have appeared in an Israelite code drawn up at *any* time during which its influence was still felt. But, as a matter of fact, not a single parallel between P and the Code of Ḥammurabi exists: there is *no* point of contact between them[2]; so that no

[1] See p. 88. [2] See p. 124, *n.* 1.

inference whatever, not even the very problematical one just referred to, as to the early date of P, can be drawn from the existence of the Code of Hammurabi. Nor (for the reason just given in the case of P) does the Code of Ḥammurabi even afford *proof* that the laws of JE are to be placed before the prophets: but the fact, as has been already said, is not doubted by critics; they do not, therefore, need the questionable support of the Code of Hammurabi to justify them.

Or, again, take Professor Sayce's statement that "the details of the purchase of the cave of Macpelah by Abraham are in strict conformity with the requirements of Babylonian commercial law as it was administered in the Abrahamic age." Now, to prove that the details are in conformity with the Babylonian law *as it was administered in the Abrahamic age*, and that the contents of Gen. xxiii. must therefore have been *written down in the Abrahamic age*, it is necessary to show that the transaction and its details described in this chapter occur *only* in documents *dating from the period of Abraham*, and do *not* occur *subsequently*. But Professor Sayce entirely fails to do this. For instance, the terms 'shekel' and 'weigh' (of money), to which he refers, occur repeatedly in *Hebrew* writings of the *seventh* century, and even later (Zech. xi. 12; Esth. iii. 9); even 'current' (*v.* 16) occurs in 2 Kings xii. 4 (Heb. xii. 5): see further Skinner, *Genesis*, p. 335.

Again, other instances from the patriarchal stories have been brought forward with the purpose of showing that the patriarchs "lived under the law of Ḥammurabi." Now, even if it be admitted to be a fact that the patriarchs are represented as living under the Babylonian Code, nothing is thereby proved as to the date at which Genesis was written: it might have been written at *any* time after the Code of Ḥammurabi was promulgated and during which its influence lasted. But, in fact, the resemblances appealed to are not sufficiently distinctive to show that the patriarchs lived under the Code of Ḥammurabi. The case which has perhaps the greatest apparent plausibility is the law of Ḥammurabi (§ 146) which prohibits a concubine slave who is arrogant towards her mistress from being sold, if she has borne a child to her master: this, it is argued, explains the treatment of Hagar in Gen. xvi. 5, 6 and xxi. 10 and 14. But there is nothing in either narrative implying that Hagar *could* not, by law, be sold. In Mohammedan countries, even to the

present day, there is a strong and widespread feeling of the impropriety of selling a concubine slave who has borne her master children: but even supposing such a feeling as this to have operated with Sarah, the fact just mentioned shows that there is no necessity for calling in the Law of Ḥammurabi to explain it; and the argument that would prove the Law of Ḥammurabi to "lie behind" the action of Abraham and Sarah, and the narrative of Genesis, would prove it also to "lie behind" Mohammedan custom at the present day![1]

Nor are the allusions to Egyptian customs in the Joseph-narratives sufficient to counteract the evidence that they are of composite authorship and of a later date than Moses. Archæology, on the contrary, is far from showing that they are contemporary with the events recorded; much less does it support the strange suggestion that these narratives are translated from a hieratic papyrus, or reflect in particular the Egypt of the Hyksos age: see the authorities cited below on pp. 85, *n.* 1, 86, *n.* 2.[2]

[1] See further Driver, *Genesis*, *Addenda* (in edd. 7–9), pp. XXXVI. f. The custom of having concubine slaves was, and still is, common in the Semitic East; and the existence of the custom in Israel is implied in Ex. xxi. 7–9. On Gen. xiv., see Chapman, *op. cit.*, pp. 314 ff.; Skinner, *Genesis*, pp. 257 f.; Driver, *Genesis*, *Addenda*, pp. XXXIV.–VI.

[2] With regard to the narratives of the Flood, see p. 93, *n.* 1 of the present work; and for a discussion of the Elephantine Papyri, pp. 131–7.

The facts which archæological discoveries have brought to light in their bearing upon the narratives of the Pentateuch have many times been set forth with admirable clearness; and the misstatements, and illogical arguments, by which it is often made to appear as if critical conclusions had been overthrown by Archæology have been repeatedly exposed; see for example G. Buchanan Gray, *The Expositor*, May 1898, pp. 337 ff. (a review of Sayce, *Early History of the Hebrews*); S. A. Cook, *The Expositor*, June 1906, pp. 529 ff.; W. H. Bennett, *Contemporary Review*, April 1906, pp. 518 ff.; or Professor W. G. Jordan's helpful volume, *Biblical Criticism and Modern Thought*, 1909 (especially pp. 42 ff., 300 ff.). In all cases it will be found, if the arguments are brought to the test of facts, either that critics have *not* held the opinions attributed to them, or that the opinions which they do hold have *not* been overthrown by Archæology. Ch. XI. of Dr. Orr's *Problem of the Old Testament* (though this deals more with the bearing of Archæology on *historical* criticism) is equally inconclusive: it shows that, especially

in the later history, the monuments attest various facts which no leading critic has ever questioned; it does *not* show that Archæology proves, or even renders it probable, that the Pentateuch was written in the Mosaic age. On Dr. Orr's general position the reader will find two illuminative articles by Professor A. S. Peake in *The Contemporary Review*, April 1907, pp. 493–509, and *The Interpreter*, April 1908, pp. 253 ff.

For a general estimate of the bearing of Archæology on criticism, see Driver in Hogarth, *Authority and Archæology*, 1899, pp. 141-51, and, with special reference to Pentateuchal Criticism, Chapman, *op. cit.*, Appendix X. With regard to M. G. Kyle, *The Deciding Voice of the Monuments in Biblical Criticism*, 1912 (Oberlin, Ohio), the Rev. M. Linton Smith, in *The Churchman*, March 1913, pp. 239 f., points out, to use his own words, "a few examples of the loose reasoning and incorrect statements in which the book abounds." See also Professor G. A. Barton's cogent criticisms of the same book in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* (Boston, U.S.A.), Dec. 1913, pp. 244 ff. Another recently published book on the same side, intended for unlearned readers, abounds in misconceptions and misstatements of fact. One example must here suffice. The reader is informed that, as Sargon (Is. xx. 1) was otherwise unknown, either from the Bible or from other records of antiquity, "the higher critics decided" that he was a "myth," and "had never existed." The facts are these:—Sargon's name was first read on the monuments in 1847; and *not one* of the critics of the previous generation questioned his existence:—Eichhorn in 1816, Gesenius in 1821, Hitzig in 1833, Ewald in 1840, and Knobel in 1843, all rightly concluded that he was a king who reigned between Shalmaneser and Sennacherib. The discovery of Sargon's name on the monuments, so far from revealing the "ignorance" of critics, in fact incontrovertibly confirmed their insight and sound judgment.

CHAPTER III

THE PRIESTLY SOURCE

THE present chapter is intended to illustrate the varied evidence which the Pentateuch itself supplies for the separation of the work of the so-called 'Priestly' writer or school from the other sources employed by the compiler of the first four books of Moses.[1] This evidence has existed ever since the compilation of these books; it would continue to exist and to demand attention, even if to-day the whole world still ignored it. Moreover, this internal evidence is, as will apppear,[2] abundantly supported by the actual history of the Hebrews, by their known customs, their actual institutions, and their general historical evolution. Again, another quite independent line of argument pointing to the same conclusion is supplied by a consideration of the inner meaning of the lines of religious and theological development laid down by God in His providential guidance of man's gradual apprehension of His Self-revelation, whether in the Jewish or in the Christian Church.[3]

The present chapter will, therefore, be confined to the brief exposition, with a few illustrations, of the various ways in which the first four of the Mosaic books themselves put forward their own evidence—whether we welcome it or not—of their composite origin and of the

[1] The fifth book, Deuteronomy, will be dealt with separately in Ch. V.

[2] See Ch. VI. below.

[3] See Ch. VII. below.

fact that one of their sources, the Priestly writing, has been preserved so intact, and so absolutely distinct from the others, that it can and must be separated from them. We shall observe that the sacred text presents its evidence to us along *three* diverse and independent lines, each of which is in itself sufficient to lead us to the same conclusion, viz., that P was originally a separate and distinct work. These independent lines of evidence are (1) diversity of style, phraseology, and language, (2) diversity in the representation of facts, and (3) diversity of theological and general mental attitude. As J. J. S. Perowne, afterwards Bishop of Worcester, said fifty years ago, "we find, for instance, the same story told by the two writers, and their accounts manifestly interwoven; and we find also certain favourite words and phrases which distinguish the one writer from the other."[1] With regard to the relative ages of P and the non-Priestly source Dr. Orr, who is far from accepting the critical hypothesis in its entirety, writes, "It is difficult to resist the conviction that P must be regarded as relatively later than JE,[2] for whose narratives, in Genesis at least, it furnishes the 'framework'" (*op. cit.*, p. 201).

But still more emphatic is the witness borne by Professor Sayce to the principle of the separation of the Pentateuch into various sources. In his *Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments*,[3] he states deliberately, and as his own opinion, that "one of the most assured results of the literary analysis of the Old Testament

[1] In Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* (published in 1863), article PENTATEUCH, vol. ii., p. 775, with reference to the narrative of the Flood (on p. 776 the Priestly and non-Priestly accounts of the Flood are printed side by side).

[2] For the use of this term to denote the non-Priestly material, see p. 72 below.

[3] 1st ed. 1894, 7th ed. 1908.

records has been the existence of documents of different age and authorship in the Pentateuch." [1] He affirms, on the same page, that this fact " is fully in accordance with the teachings of oriental archæology," and he illustrates this by the composite character of certain ancient Egyptian and Babylonian texts. His final verdict is that " the ' higher ' criticism of the Old Testament has thus been justified in its literary analysis of the Books of Moses." [2]

Those few who still deny that the internal evidence demands that P should be recognised as a source separate from the other sources usually tend to ignore one or more of these three lines of evidence. For instance, they frequently, but, as we shall see, quite wrongly, suppose, as was illustrated in Ch. II., that the alternation of the Divine appellatives is the *only* way in which P may be distinguished from the other sources. Practically none of them attempts a thorough or systematic answer to the evidence constituted by the presence in P of a characteristic style, phraseology, and vocabulary, absent from the other sources. Thus, on p. 18 of the *S.P.C.K.* translation, Dahse writes with regard to the Biblical narrative of the Flood (Gen. vi. 5–ix. 29): " A double source is assumed not only from the use of the names of God, but especially also from the abundance of repetitions." Here Dahse, it is true, writes as if he admits that the names of God are not the sole or even the chief criterion. But of the only other criterion he allows here, namely that of the repetitions, he mentions only one example, and even that he fails to treat in a serious and scholarly spirit. Of the stylistic and linguistic

[1] *Ibid.*, 31.

[2] *Ibid.*, 34. On Professor Sayce's position the reader may consult the articles and books mentioned on pp. 39, *n.* 2 and 93, *n.* 1.

differences (of which numerous instances will be given) he here says *nothing*, though apparently this sentence purports to be a complete summary of the critics' reasons for their division of the story of the Flood into a P source and another quite independent one![1] Two or three instances, however, taken from both the narrative and the legislative sections of the first four books of the Pentateuch, will suffice to show how numerous and conclusive are the various items of the evidence forthcoming from them and arranging itself along each of the three lines alluded to above. The reader should, therefore, note carefully the cogency and explicitness of the numerous stylistic and linguistic criteria; Professor Orr himself admits that even a selected portion of them is enough "to justify the critic in distinguishing a P hand in Genesis, different from that of JE."[2]

A select list of stylistic and linguistic characteristics of P appears in the appendix to this chapter; this should be constantly referred to by the reader as he peruses the instances which are given in the following pages.

In Gen. i.–ii. 4[a] there stands a record of Creation. It is probably based, like the story of the Flood, on ancient Hebrew tradition containing elements derived ultimately from that of Babylonia.[3] But its particular *style* and *phraseology*, like the full monotheism which pervades it, naturally owes its origin to the Hebrew writer who cast it into its present form. This style is stereotyped, and picturesque touches are conspicuously wanting; the

[1] The dilemma with regard to this matter which Dahse propounds on p. 20 of the same pamphlet will be dealt with below on p. 93, *n.* 1.

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 197.

[3] Of the Babylonian traditions of creation a relic is preserved in the Epic of Marduk, which has quite a number of points in common with Gen. i. 1–ii. 4[a]. See Driver, *Genesis*, pp. 27–31, and R. W. Rogers, *Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament*, 1912, pp. 1–44.

phraseology is marked by recurring formulæ of a similar character to those which, as we shall see, mark certain other Pentateuchal narratives. The word *God* (*'Elōhīm*) is alone employed to designate the Creator. We note the recurring "And God said . . . ," "And it was so," "And God saw . . . it was good," "And there was evening and there was morning, one (a second, a third, etc.) day," "after its kind." A peculiar precision pervades the whole, seen in such phrases as, *e.g.*, "divide the waters from the waters" (repeated even more precisely in *v.* 7), "herb yielding seed," "fruit tree bearing fruit"; there is scarcely a single verse but illustrates this. Moreover, a statement in comparatively general terms is often partly repeated with a view to its closer definition or limitation. True, this kind of style sometimes rises to the height of an impressive dignity, as it does here or, for example, in Gen. xlvii. 7–11; but the circumstantiality which is characteristic of P, though in Gen. ix., xvii., xxiii., for instance, effective and emphatic, is sometimes excessive, *e.g.* in Num. vii. Again, this narrative of creation contains many words that are specially and distinctively characteristic of it and of other sections of the Pentateuch which on this or other grounds we assign to the document which we call P. Moreover, it is not simply a question of the striking choice of peculiar individual Hebrew words; there is also seen the characteristic habit of combining several of them into regular stereotyped phrases, *e.g.*, "Be fruitful and multiply and fill . . ."

But turn to the remainder of the second chapter of Genesis. Here for the first time LORD (Jehovah) appears as a name for the Creator, while none of the peculiarities alluded to above are now present. There is here no longer any trace of a stereotyped, measured, prosaic

writing. No longer are the stages definitely marked; no longer do recurring formulæ meet the eye. Method and precision give way to freedom and fluency in narration, circumstantiality designed to give emphasis and completeness yields to the dramatic picturesqueness of the untrammelled inspiration of the narrative-poet. Such *combinations* of words and phrases as we have alluded to above in connection with Gen. i.–ii. 4[a] are now absent. We even find different words used to express the same thoughts or actions. The striking word translated 'create' (*bāra'*), for instance, gives way to 'form,' 'fashion' (*yāṣar*), a picturesque metaphor borrowed from the potter's craft. Above, on pp. 8 f., we noticed the difference in style between Jeremiah and the priestly prophet Ezekiel; the differences between ch. ii. and ch. i. of Genesis are at least equally great.[1]

A few verses from these two stories of Creation are at this point printed side by side, that the reader may appreciate the many divergences in style and vocabulary and phraseology which present themselves even in these excerpts.

I. In the beginning God created the heaven and
2. the earth. And the earth was without form and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep: and the spirit of God was brooding upon the face of
3. the waters. And God said, Let there be light:

II. 4[b]. In the day that the LORD[2] God made earth
5. and heaven, no shrub of the field was yet in the earth, and no herb of the field had yet sprung up: for the LORD God had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was not a man to till the ground;

[1] In fact, the style and vocabulary of sections in the Pentateuch closely related to Gen. i., *i.e.* the 'Priestly' work, seem more than accidentally related to the literary priestly circles which partly preceded, and partly immediately succeeded, Ezekiel's activities.

[2] Heb. *Jehovah*, as in other places where LORD is put in capitals.

4. and there was light. And
God saw the light, that
it was good: and God
divided the light from the
5. darkness. And God called
the light Day, and the
darkness he called Night.
And evening and morning
came, one day.
6. And God said, Let there
be a firmament in the
midst of the waters, and
let it divide the waters
7. from the waters. And
God made the firmament,
and divided the waters
which were under the
firmament from the
waters which were above
the firmament: and it was
8. so. And God called the
firmament Heaven. And
evening came and morn-
ing came, a second day.
9. And God said, Let the
waters under the heaven
be gathered together unto
one place, and let the dry
land appear: and it was
10. so. And God called the
dry land Earth; and the
gathering together of the
waters called he Seas: and
God saw that it was good.
11. And God said, Let the
earth put forth grass, herb
yielding seed, *and* fruit
tree bearing fruit after its
kind, wherein is the seed
thereof, upon the earth:
12. and it was so. And the
earth brought forth grass,
6. but a mist used to go up
from the earth, and water
the whole face of the
7. ground. And the LORD
God formed man of the
dust of the ground, and
breathed into his nostrils
the breath of life; and
man became a living soul.
8. And the LORD God planted
a garden eastward, in
Eden; and there he put
the man whom he had
9. formed. And out of the
ground made the LORD
God to grow every tree
that is pleasant to the
sight, and good for food;
the tree of life also in the
midst of the garden, and
the tree of the knowledge
10. of good and evil. And a
river went out of Eden to
water the garden; and
from thence it was parted,
and became four heads.

. . . . .

. . . . .

18. And the LORD God said,
It is not good that the
man should be alone; I
will make him an help
corresponding to him.
19. And out of the ground
the LORD God formed
every beast of the field,
and every fowl of the air;
and brought them unto the
man to see what he would
call them: and whatso-
ever the man called every
living soul, that was the

herb yielding seed after its kind, and tree bearing fruit, wherein is the seed thereof, after its kind: and God saw that it was
13. good. And evening came and morning came, a third day . . . . .
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
. . . . . .
. . . . . .

II. And the heaven and the earth were finished, and
2. all the host of them. And on the seventh day God finished his work which he had made; and he desisted on the seventh day from all his work which
3. he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it: because that in it he desisted from all his work which God creatively made.
4. These are the generations of the heaven and of the earth when they were created.

20. name thereof. And the man gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field; but for man[1] there was not found an help meet for
21. him. And the LORD God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man, and he slept; and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof:
22. and the rib, which the LORD God had taken from the man, builded he into a woman, and brought her
23. unto the man. And the man said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman,[2] because she was taken out
24. of Man.[3] Therefore doth a man leave his father and his mother, and cleave unto his wife: and they become one flesh. And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed.

Along with these differences in style and phraseology go a number of still more striking differences in *representation of facts*. While in Gen. i. the waters at first cover the whole surface of the earth, in Gen. ii. the earth is at first destitute of all standing water or rivers. In the former man and woman both come into being at the same moment, as the climax to the whole work of

[1] Or, *'Ādām*. [2] Heb. *'Ishshāh*. [3] Heb. *'Ish*.

creation ; in the latter man appears at the outset, alone and forlorn, then vegetation, then animals, finally woman, taken from man, is provided to relieve his loneliness—but all this without any well-defined periods to mark the various stages of the process, and without any statement as to the final cessation of the Divine activity in creation. No categorical assertion such as " These are the generations of the heavens and the earth," which rounds off the first narrative, occurs in either the opening or the closing paragraph of the second.[1]

Again, these stylistic and phraseological differences, and these divergences in representation of facts, are accompanied by specific differences in *theology*, and in the *mental method* of approaching the topic. The God Who ' creates ' in the first story, does so by the word of His mouth—' God *said* ; ' no action is predicated of Him which necessitates actual physical contact on His part with the objects of His actions. The writer's chief purposes are, first, to inculcate the purest transcendental monotheism ; and, secondly, to teach that Sabbath-observance is a virtue of the very Godhead.

But in the second story of Creation both the narrator's theology and his purpose in telling his story are different. The truths which he inculcates are equally valuable to *us* ; but all the same, as they are set forth in the story, they are the result of the Divine inspiration working through the mind of an author who possessed an outlook other than that of the writer of the first account.

Unlike the latter, the author of this second story evidently does not regard Jehovah as a transcendent God, Who operates *merely* by His word. In the conception

[1] On ii. 4a, as well as the rest of Gen. i. and ii., see Driver, *Genesis*, *ad loc.*

of this narrator, the LORD (Jehovah) *walks* the earth, Himself *moulds* man's material frame, and *breathes* into man the divine afflatus of conscious and sensible life, *plants*, *places*, *takes*, *sets*, *brings*, *builds*, and stoops even to *close up* man's wounded side. In this and the two following chapters (which are all three stylistically and in very many other respects related to one another) he seeks to tell of the origin of the wonders and mysteries of life and of things around him—the distinction of sexes; the institution of marriage; the presence in himself and in all whom he knows of an all-pervading sinfulness, allied with tendencies to good; the custom of wearing clothing; the subtle, repulsive serpent; woman's actual subjection to man though she be potentially capable of equality and companionship with him; the cruel pains of child-birth; the unending drudgery of all agricultural pursuits.

This should suffice to convince the reader that, while the stereotyped, unalterable, lawyer-like head-lines "These are the generations of . . .,"[1] and Gen. i.–ii. 3 (and, for that matter, many another story in the Pentateuch and much of the legislation), evidently emanate from one and the same writer, who consistently adhered to his own peculiar style, phraseology, and point of view, *there are other sections*, such as Gen. ii. 4a–iv., which are *manifestly not his work*. They have been *incorporated* in his work, either by himself or by someone else—but with that question we are not now concerned, for we are at present dealing only with the actual facts with which we are faced, not with any explanation of

[1] These are systematically introduced as a heading to each new period of world history or to each new patriarchal epoch, *e.g.*, ii. 4a; v. 1 (*this is the book of the generations of . . .*); vi. 9; x. 1; xi. 10, 27; xxv. 12, 19; xxxvi. 1, 9; xxxvii. 2.

how and *why* such facts came into existence. This lawyer-like writer's work, therefore, with its stereotyped phraseology, its characteristic vocabulary, its striking literary combinations, its remarkably transcendental view of the Deity, and its magnificent insistence on man's observance of certain outward acts of homage to God, such as the Sabbath, Circumcision, etc., *can be* and *must be* recognised as distinct in its origin from all other narratives and legislation which do not share in its essential and central point of view.

But it must not be thought that one who thus carefully incorporated sources which are so distinct, and which, nevertheless, so extensively overlap each other in regard to the general subjects with which they deal, would always content himself with merely placing divergent narratives side by side. That would indeed be a tiresome and superfluous process when there was a possibility of dovetailing one into the other. If the mediæval chroniclers resorted to such dovetailing, if Arabic historians went to work in somewhat similar fashion, if the Syrian Tatian or again the Hindu compiler of the great Law-book of Manu proceeded on this principle, if others outside and also *inside* the Old Testament could, as we have shown they did, adopt this skilful method of preserving all that was good in their sources, and at the same time of bringing their work within reasonable proportions—are we to believe that the compiler of the Pentateuch was less skilful, not equally anxious to preserve the inspired records of the past and at the same time equally anxious to keep his work within readable limits ?

The next large section after Gen. i.–iv., viz. vi. 5–ix. 29, shows with what precision and with what consideration for each tradition and for the details peculiar to it the

compiler achieved his purpose. How sparingly he used his own language to accommodate one to the other is shown by the fact that practically all that remains after the separation of P[1] belongs to his second source.

Ch. vi. 9 opens with the characteristic formula "These are the generations of Noah," and ix. 28, 29 closes the whole account in that stereotyped phraseology, and with that love of precision and statistical accuracy, which we have already observed in, and naturally associate with, the author whose narrative stands first in Genesis. This precise methodical treatment of every topic with which it deals is an invariable characteristic of the whole section vi. 9–22. It recurs, moreover, in the minute description of the Ark and its dimensions, in the catalogue of those whom the Ark saved, *etc.* (*cf.* vii. 24; viii. 1, 2^a, 3^b–5, 13^a, 14–19; ix. 1–17). We note also still more essential points of style and phraseology and representation which stamp these verses as the work of the author of Gen. i. Here, as there, *God* (*'Elōhīm*) is used. Again, for instance, 'kind' (*mīn*), which has occurred in Gen. i. (*e.g.* in *vv.* 11, 12 twice, 21 twice, 24 twice, 25 thrice), occurs also here (seven times); so do 'swarm' (vii. 21;

[1] See the analysis of sections belonging to P on pp. 70 f. The second narrative from J, therefore, starts at Gen. vi. 5; Dahse must have overlooked this fact when he asserted that it is 'lacking beginning' (*op. cit.*, p. 20), for, whether the critical position is adopted or not, vi. 5 is the only 'beginning' to the whole section vi. 5–ix. 17, which the sacred record as it stands itself supplies! If it is argued that vi. 1–4 and not vi. 5 is the real 'beginning,' this makes no difference, since vi. 1–4 is (quite independently) assigned by critics to J as much as is vi. 5. Naturally, it should cause no surprise that, as P's account of the making of the Ark is given, J's parallel account of this is omitted. For, as we have noticed already, it is of the essence of the dovetailing method, which we are now considering, by such omissions to reduce the extent of unnecessary overlapping of duplicate accounts and thus to prevent the compilation as a whole from running to undue length.

viii. 17; ix. 7), 'for food' (ix. 3), 'male and female' (see below). The same characteristic combinations again present themselves, *e.g.* especially 'be fruitful and multiply' (ix. 1, 7); note also the closer definition of vi. 19 by vi. 20. Moreover, just as these points take us back to Gen. i., a number of others, which occur here, also recur in several subsequent sections which bear the other distinguishing marks of this same writer's style (see the Appendix to the present chapter, pp. 65–70).

But now compare these verses with the remainder of vi. 5–ix. 29.[1] Differences in style, vocabulary, and combinations of words present themselves in a manner exactly parallel to what we have observed in our comparison of the first two chapters of the book. While in the verses of stereotyped style *God* (*'Elōhīm*) is always used, in the others LORD (Jehovah) appears—and now absolutely alone. In the former Noah escaped because he was 'a righteous man' (vi. 9), in the latter because he 'found favour' (vi. 8); in the former the corruption and destruction extends to 'all flesh' (*e.g.* vi. 12, a phrase occurring in this narrative thirteen times), in the latter the corruption of the 'imagination of the thoughts of his heart' (vi. 5) results in the destruction of 'every living thing' (vii. 4, 23, a peculiar form found only here and in Deut. xi. 6); in the former God 'destroyed' (Hebrew *shāḥath*, vi. 13, 17; ix. 11, 15), in the latter (vi. 7; vii. 4, 23) the LORD (Jehovah) 'blotted out' (R.V. marg., which is better than R.V. text, 'destroy,' the Hebrew being *māḥah*); only in the former (vi. 17; vii. 21) is used the expression 'expired' (R.V. 'die,' in

[1] See p. 70 for a list of P's sections. The remainder the compiler has inserted from this other source with only one or two editorial insertions such as Tatian found necessary in his *Diatessaron* (see pp. 13 f. above).

vi. 17; vii. 21; but the Hebrew word, *gāwaʿ*, is unusual, and, except in P, confined to poetry); in the former 'male and female' is in the Hebrew the technical *zāḳār ūneḳēbāh* (R.V. 'male and female,' *e.g.* vi. 19; vii. 16), but in the latter we find the Hebrew *'īsh we'ishtō* (vii. 2), 'each and his mate,' (lit. 'man and his wife'[1]; R.V. 'the male and his female' does not exhibit the entire unlikeness in the Hebrew from 'male and female' in vi. 19, etc.)

In representation of facts again they show similar differences. In what is evidently P the waters 'prevail' for a hundred and fifty days, and their duration comes to a total of one year eleven days (vii. 11; viii. 14); in the other narrative they increase for forty days and nights, and their total duration is sixty-one days (vii. 12; viii. 6, 10, 12). In P the flood is caused by the opening of heaven's windows and the subterranean sluices (vii. 11; viii. 2^a); in the other by the downpour of the winter rains (vii. 7, 12; viii. 2^b); in P only two animals of each kind, whether clean or unclean, are preserved (vi. 19, 20; vii. 14, 15); in the other story two unclean but seven clean (vii. 2). P mostly confines his narrative to statistical observations such as these, which for one reason or another seemed to him so important; J, on the other hand, revels in the delightful details of the raven, the dove, and the olive leaf (viii. 6–11). In P Noah's escape is consummated by the covenant of the bow (ix. 8–17); in the other by the sacrificial festival (viii. 20–22).

In theology and general thought the two narratives also diverge along exactly the same lines as the first two chapters have been shown to do. The God of P is a

[1] 'Man' (*'īsh*) and 'woman' (*'ishshāh*) are used in Hebrew, in phrases such as this, of animals and even of inanimate objects.

transcendent Deity, Whom rainbow and nature's deepest mysteries obey, Who Himself lays down definite categorical regulations with regard to the punishment of homicide not for the Hebrews only, but for all mankind (ix. 5, 6).[1] In the other source, on the other hand, the LORD (Jehovah) is alluded to in an anthropomorphic style similar to that in ch. ii. ('repented,' vi. 6; 'grieved at the heart,' vi. 6; Himself 'shut in,' vii. 16; 'smelled,' viii. 21).

The criteria afforded by these stories of Creation and the Flood have been purposely dealt with at some considerable length, (*a*) because they stand at the very beginning of the Pentateuch, (*b*) because they illustrate the actual employment in the Pentateuch of the alternative methods of setting two divergent narratives side by side, and of dovetailing them more closely into one another, and (*c*) because it is specially instructive to show by concrete instances how *numerous* in any given section are the divergences in (i) style, phraseology, and vocabulary,[2] (ii) representation of facts, and (iii) theological and mental attitude.

Even apart from (ii) and (iii) the stylistic and linguistic differences are more than sufficiently numerous, various, and cogent of themselves, to demonstrate diversity of authorship. And yet the opponents of the critics, to judge from their writings, appear to think that the latter base all or nearly all their arguments on the mere

[1] Troelstra, to judge from his remarks (*op. cit.*, p. 24), forgets that P is here laying down a *general* principle, and that the distinction between intentional homicide and unintentional manslaughter which he desiderates is expressed by P in Num. xxxv. 9–34, a passage which lays down for the latter offence more explicit regulations than Deut. xix. 4, 5 had prescribed.

[2] A list of words and phrases specially characteristic of each is given on pp. 65–70 below.

alternation of the Divine appellatives LORD (Jehovah) and *God* (*'Elōhīm*)![1] Of all these other criteria (which are set out at length on pp. 65–70) they have little or nothing to say. On the contrary, they feverishly devote their energies chiefly to minimising this one difference of LORD (Jehovah) and *God* (*'Elōhīm*). Of this misdirected and mistaken zeal Troelstra and Dahse are indeed excellent examples; to what straits they are reduced in their endeavours to make good their case will be shown on pp. 177-202 below.

It should, however, be firmly grasped that the question is not simply one of the *mere alternation* of LORD (Jehovah) and *God* (*'Elōhīm*). In Ex. vi. 3 we read "I am JEHOVAH: and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, as God Almighty (*'Ēl Shaddāi*), but by my name JEHOVAH I was not known unto them." Now, in the very first chapter of Genesis and in one of the narratives of the Flood, as we have seen, and—as the reader himself can observe—in many subsequent sections of P in *Genesis*, the name *God* (*'Elōhīm*) is employed both by the narrator himself and in the words which he puts into God's own mouth. Such a word could well be used to express the Self-revelation of the Absolute to man in general, disclosed in the great creative work of calling nature into ordered existence and humanity into conscious life, and in the providential working out of the general destinies of mankind throughout the inhabited world. But when the God Who finally revealed His whole Self in Jesus Christ first made a certain man, Abraham, conscious of the germ of His specific Self-revelation preparatory to this Final Manifestation, we are told in Gen. xvii. 1 that He summed up the initial step in the communication to him of the more sacred

[1] *Cf.* pp. 24 f. above.

name *'Ēl Shaddāi*—"I am God Almighty (margin: Heb. *'Ēl Shaddāi*); walk before me, and be thou perfect." And so Isaac, and Jacob too, are in possession of this fuller revelation; for by that name Isaac blesses Jacob (Gen. xxviii. 3), and in that name God Himself reassures Jacob when he returns from Padan-Aram (xxxv. 11). Only in the light of these passages, therefore, can we rightly appreciate the terms of the still fuller revelation vouchsafed to Moses: "I am JEHOVAH: and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, as God Almighty (*'Ēl Shaddāi*), but by my name JEHOVAH I was not known unto them."[1]

These passages of P, with their carefully and deliberately marked gradation of the transcendent God's Self-revelation, clearly cohere together. How different from them are the instances in which another narrator not only puts the name LORD (Jehovah) into the mouth of God Himself (Gen. xv. 7;[2] xxviii. 13[3]), but also consistently introduces it into his own narration of events. How different again are those other, non-Priestly, sections in which the name *God* (*'Elōhīm*) is in general use in the period before Moses, and in which we find the *abrupt* transition from *God* (*'Elōhīm*) to the fuller revelation of LORD (Jehovah) in Ex. iii. 14. Thus, even granting that Troelstra and Dahse were right—though we do not admit that they are right—they would reduce the *large number* of differences that actually present themselves (see pp.

[1] On Dahse's extraordinary attempt to neutralise this evidence by eliminating *'Ēl Shaddāi* altogether from Gen. xvii. 1, xxviii. 3, xxxv. 11, xliii. 14, xlviii. 3, Ex. vi. 3, see the Appendix on the Divine names at the end of the present volume, pp. 177-182.

[2] "And he said unto him, I am the LORD that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees, to give thee this land to inherit it."

[3] "And, behold, the LORD stood above it, and said, I am the LORD, the God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac: the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed."

197-202 below) by *one* only!—and that, too, a difference which, as all are agreed, extends only as far as Ex. vi. 3.

After Ex. vi. 3 all the other criteria for the separation of P still remain quite as clear and as distinctive as they have been up to this point. The further one penetrates into the remaining books of the Pentateuch, the more numerous and cogent do they become. Examine, for instance, the story of the spies in Num. xiii.-xiv. A comparison of the literary characteristics of the sections assigned on pp. 70 f. to P with the list on pp. 65–70, will show that their style and phraseology is identical with that of P. The differences in representation between these and the remaining verses of these chapters point with almost equal force to the same conclusion. In P (xiii. 21) the spies traverse the *whole country* to Rehob in the extreme North; in the other narrative (xiii. 22) they penetrate only to *Hebron* in Southern Judah. In P (xiii. 32) they report that the land is impoverished; in the other (xiii. 26^{b}–27; xiv. 8, 9) that it is fertile. In P (xiv. 6, 7, 26–30) two of the spies, Joshua and Caleb, calm the people, and they are not included in the punishment of the rest; in the other story (xiii. 30; xiv. 24) Joshua is not even one of the spies—Caleb *alone* pacifies them.

So far we have endeavoured to illustrate the various ways in which the more strictly *narrative* sections of the first four books of Moses themselves offer conclusive evidence that they are derived from at least two distinct sources, one of which is aptly termed the Priestly narrative. The same evidence is afforded by the *legal* sections. These sections are chiefly limited to (*a*) Ex. xx.-xxiii. (of which xx. 23–xxiii. 19 is in xxiv. 7 called the 'Book of the Covenant'), along with which must be grouped the injunctions embedded in Ex. xiii. 3–16, xxxiv. 11–27; (*b*) Ex. xxv.-xxxi. (the injunctions of which

are for the most part simply carried out *verbatim* in Ex. xxxv.–xl.); the whole of Leviticus; Num. i.–x. 10; and miscellaneous laws intermingled with narrative sections in Num. xv.–xix., xxv. 6–xxxvi.

The stylistic and literary characteristics, the representation, and the mental and theological outlook of the laws grouped above under (*b*) show that they are quite separate and distinct from those under (*a*). Indeed, they must belong to a quite different period or epoch in the growth of the nation's customs and institutions and religion; with this point we shall be more immediately concerned in Chs. VI. and VII. Here we need only note, for instance, that in P (in contrast to the other source utilised in this section) Noah takes no account of the sacrificial distinction between clean and unclean animals and offers no sacrifice of any kind on his release from the Ark.[1] Again, while in the Priestly narrative the patriarchs live, it is true, near sacred spots, they never in that narrative build altars or sacrifice at them, as they do in the non-Priestly sections. In the judgment of the Priestly writer sacrifice was unknown, or at any rate unacceptable to God, till Moses, at God's bidding (Ex. xxv.–xxxi.), had constructed the Travelling Tabernacle in the wilderness (Ex. xxxv.–xl.). Thus the Priestly narratives and laws cohere together in being both *different* from the other laws and narratives, and in being connected together by numerous stylistic and other resemblances.

How different from this is not only the simple description of the tent in Ex. xxxiii. 7–11,[2] but also the

[1] See above, pp. 54 f.

[2] "It is impossible to reconcile the account of this tent with that of the great priestly Tabernacle described in xxv.–xxxi., xxxv.–xl.; Num. i.–iv. 11" (A. H. McNeile, *The Book of Exodus*, 1908, p. 212, where the reasons are fully stated).

injunction of Ex. xx. 24, "An altar of earth thou shalt make unto me, and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt offerings, and thy peace offerings, thy sheep, and thine oxen: in every place where I record my name I will come unto thee and I will bless thee." The latter enjoins what was actually the custom of the patriarchs and of the centuries immediately following the settlement in Canaan, viz. sacrifice and worship at local 'places' or sanctuaries. P, on the other hand, does not even know of any such custom or injunction which needs to be revoked. He *presupposes* the legality of sacrifice at *one* spot only, and then, in the laws which are peculiarly his own, proceeds at once to give copious regulations for its performance. Moreover, neither the 'Book of the Covenant' nor the injunctions in Ex. xxxiv. 11–27 once mention even a single professional priest of any kind or of any particular tribe in connection with sacrifices;[1] in P, however, the three orders, high priest, Aaronic priests, and Levites, as supremely vital to the whole sacrificial religion as there set forth, belong to the very essence of the writer's thought. Quite as important differences appear in the case of the other topics with which both the divergent groups of laws deal, *e.g.* sacred seasons, Sabbath observances, or kinds of sacrifices. For full details of the remarkable differences the *Tabular Appendix B* in Carpenter and Harford, *op. cit.*, pp. 426–508, should be consulted. For the stylistic and linguistic characteristics the reader should look carefully into the select list printed below, pp. 65–70, or, *e.g.*, at that in

[1] *I.e.* the sacrifice would be performed by ordinary Israelites (compare Ex. xx. 24, "*Thou* shalt sacrifice," addressed to individual Israelites as a whole). Though 'priests' are mentioned in Ex. xix. 22, 24 (*cf.* Dt. x. 6, 8), the sacrifice which followed the declaration of the 'Book of the Covenant' at Sinai-Horeb Moses ordered to be performed by "young men of the children of Israel" (Ex. xxiv. 5).

McNeile, *Exodus*, pp. iii–v. Still fuller lists appear in Carpenter and Harford, *op. cit.*, pp. 408–25. It is worth noting, however, even in this necessarily brief survey, that in P (*e.g.* in Lev. ii. 4–16; vi. 14–18) the Hebrew word *minḥah* means, as in Ezekiel, a cereal ('meal'), or non-blood, species of 'oblation' (*ḳorban*), whereas outside P in the Pentateuch it is a general term used in place of the latter word to include both blood and non-blood offerings (*e.g.* Gen. iv. 3, 4, 5).

A brief supplementary statement must be made at this point with regard to Lev. xvii.–xxvi. That the Priestly writer himself incorporated this section among his own laws is shown by the undoubted presence within it of the style, terminology, and point of view, of the 'Priestly' writings. But once these characteristics are isolated, the diversity of the rest from P is easily recognisable.

In the first place this section, though so short in comparison with the sum total of P, is remarkable for the number of words and phrases that occur in it and nowhere else in the Pentateuch; others are found only very rarely in P or in other parts of the Pentateuch. 'I am Jehovah' occurs nearly fifty times; it is found especially at the close of a definite precept or series of precepts. 'For I Jehovah am holy,' 'that sanctify you,' 'I will set my face against . . .,' 'I will cut off from the midst of his (its, their) people,' 'to walk in the statutes,' 'my statutes and my judgments,' 'to observe and to do,' 'to profane the name of,' 'my sabbaths,' 'bear the iniquity of,' are only some of the recurring and characteristic words and phrases tabulated with exhaustive references by Dr. Driver in his *Introduction*, (edd. 1–5, pp. 45 f.; edd. 6–9, pp. 49 f.). Of the general similarity of Ezekiel and P in style and point of view

some hint has been given already (p. 46, *n.* 1), but the closeness of the literary affinities of Ezekiel and Lev. xvii.–xxvi. is still more extraordinary. On the one hand, in the earlier prophets or writings no trace is to be found of the style or contents of these chapters; on the other hand, Ezekiel, though not, as some have thought, the author of them, must clearly have belonged to the same literary circles in which they were produced, and must indeed have been thoroughly familiar with them. Copious evidence of this is given by Dr. Driver on pp. 145–7 of the work to which reference has just been made.

Secondly, in Lev. xvii.–xxvi., the emphasis on *Holiness*, both moral and ceremonial, is remarkable. This is apparent, not only from the recurring phrases just quoted, but also from many other characteristics. To secure this is the leading principle or motive which determines the character of the injunctions here set forth and even of Jehovah Himself so far as He is delineated by this writer. This is represented as the *one* demand of Jehovah upon Israel, and the *one* distinguishing mark of that chosen nation. It is, again, the *one* motive which the compiler of these laws constantly asserts should alike animate Israel's observance of these particular injunctions and serve as their goal. Nowhere else is holiness so strongly insisted upon in this manner to the exclusion of all other virtues. Hence these chapters are most commonly termed the 'Code (or Law) of Holiness.'

Here, again, this code is related to Ezekiel in a very essential manner. Ezekiel, it should be remembered, was the great *priestly* prophet, living in the early part of the Exilic period, who drew (chs. xl.-xlviii.) a remarkable picture of his ideal of the Holy Land after his people's restoration to it, and particularly of the restored Temple and its ritual. He clearly treats the 'Code of Holiness'

as authoritative, and draws from it his inspiration almost as much as his quotations. The time of Ezekiel, therefore, is the *terminus ad quem* for its composition.

The 'Code of Holiness' has, moreover, a number of injunctions which are enforced by P in other parts of his work in different terms and with varying details. Lev. xvii. at the outset deals with the problem as to *where* sacrifices are to be offered. It is, therefore, independent of P; for to P belong Ex. xxv.–xxxi., xxxv.–xl., which presuppose the settlement of that problem. It is also equally independent of the 'Book of the Covenant' (Ex. xx. 23–xxiii.), which presupposes local sanctuaries. (Again, just as the 'Book of the Covenant' contains at its close a parenetic section (Ex. xxiii. 20–33), and just as Deut. xxviii. serves the same purpose for the independent code of laws in Deut. xii.–xxvi., so the parenetic section Lev. xxvi. 3–45 marks the close of what must, therefore, have once been another entirely independent code.

But while the 'Code of Holiness' was once quite distinct from P, and came into existence, *as a code*, shortly before Ezekiel's day, individual laws within it, in their earlier and more original form, date back to a much earlier period.[1] Probably, however, few of them, if any, rival in antiquity the 'Book of the Covenant,' from which even in their earliest form they would certainly differ, principally by reason of their comparative wealth of detail and their insistence upon moral and ceremonial rather than civil obligations.

Of the results of this separation of P and H from the rest of the matter in the first four books of the Pentateuch something will be said in Ch. VI. and more in Ch. VII.

[1] *Cf.* G. Buchanan Gray, art. Law Literature, in *Enc. Bibl.*, col. 2738, esp. footnote 1.

But even apart from the reconstruction there outlined, we ought to be grateful that the Pentateuch gives us such clear indications of the composite character of its authorship. Without this key to the inconsistencies presenting themselves throughout the very first books of our Bible, without this, the only possible, unravelling of their tangled skein, the Church of the future would be faced with the incubus which these inconsistencies present, weighing heavily upon the loyalty of the strong, and proving too great a strain upon those of less secure faith. It is a dead-weight which no one can justifiably be asked to shoulder, seeing that to do so is no longer necessary. True, the Church in her most vigorous days of the first three centuries found no great stumbling-block in these inconsistencies, even when they were pointed out by her opponents.[1] She was menaced from without by persecution, and within she had her own specific dogmas to formulate and defend. But with the Renaissance and the reawakening of learning in the West, together with the shifting of the centre of gravity which ensued, a new era dawned. As we have seen in the last chapter, even before Astruc's time the inconsistencies in fact and representation occasioned serious questionings. All, at any rate, who have had practical experience of the difficulties of the ordinary Christian to-day are sadly aware how many even now often seek refuge from these perplexing problems in entire neglect of the inspiring narratives with which they seem inevitably involved. It is beyond dispute that, largely owing to these difficulties, to many in our generation the Old Testament has become a closed book. Surely, then, we ought not to shut our eyes to such evidence as the Bible itself presents regarding the nature and the stages of its own

[1] See p. 22 above.

composition, evidence which goes so far to remove difficulties under which the Christian Church has long laboured.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER III

Characteristic Expressions of P, with a List of the Passages in the Hexateuch assigned to P

(Taken, with his kind permission, from Dr. Driver's *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, ed. 9, 1913, pp. 131-5, and p. 159.)

I

Characteristic Expressions of P

The obelus (†), attached to a list of passages, indicates that it includes all instances of the word or phrase referred to, occurring in the Old Testament.

The double obelus (††) indicates that all passages of the Hexateuch in which the word or phrase quoted occurs are cited or referred to.

1. *God*, not *Jehovah*: Gen. i. 1 and uniformly, except Gen. xvii. 1; xxi. 1b,[1] until Ex. vi. 2.
2. *Kind* (מין): Gen. i. 11, 12 *bis*, 21 *bis*, 24 *bis*, 25 *ter*; vi. 20 *ter*; vii. 14 *quater*. Lev. xi. 14, 15, 16, 19 [hence Dt. xiv. 13, 14, 15, 18], 22 *quater*, 29. Ez. xlvii. 10.†
3. *To swarm* (שרץ): Gen. i. 20, 21; vii. 21; viii. 17. Lev. xi. 29, 41, 42, 43, 46. Ez. xlvii. 9. *Fig.* of men: Gen. ix. 7. Ex. i. 7.† Once in J, Ex. viii. 3 [hence Ps. cv. 30]†; see the footnote on No. 13.
4. *Swarming things* (שרץ): Gen. i. 20; vii. 21. Lev. v. 2; xi. 10, 20 [hence Dt. xiv. 19], 21, 23, 29, 31, 41, 42, 43, 44; xxii. 5.†
5. *To be fruitful and multiply* (פרה ורבה): Gen. i. 22, 28; viii. 17; ix. 1, 7; xvii. 20 (cf. *vv.* 2 and 6); xxviii. 3; xxxv. 11; xlvii. 27; xlviii. 4. Ex. i. 7. Lev. xxvi. 9. Also Jer. xxiii. 3; and (inverted) iii. 16. Ez. xxxvi. 11.†
6. *For food* (לאכלה): Gen. i. 29, 30; vi. 21; ix. 3. Ex. xvi. 15. Lev. xi. 39; xxv. 6. Ez. xv. 4, 6; xxi. 37; xxiii. 37; xxix. 5; xxxiv. 5, 8, 10, 12; xxxix. 4.† (In Jer. xii. 9 לאכלה is an infin.)
7. *Generations* (תולדות):
   (*a*) In the phrase *These are the generations of . . .*[2]

---

[1] [The use of the Divine names, and their value as a criterion of authorship, are discussed in the Appendix to the present volume, pp. 176–202.—D. C. S.]

[2] [See above, p. 50.—D. C. S.]

(*b*) Otherwise: Gen. x. 32; xxv. 13. Ex. vi. 16, 19; xxviii. 10. Nu. i. (12 times). 1 Ch. v. 7; vii. 2, 4, 9; viii. 28; ix. 9, 34; xxvi. 31.†

8. מאת in the *st. c.*, in cases where ordinarily מאה would be said: Gen. v. 3, 6, 18, 25, 28; vii. 24; viii. 3; xi. 10, 25; xxi. 5; xxv. 7, 17; xxxv. 28; xlvii. 9, 28. Ex. vi. 16, 18, 20; xxxviii. 25, 27 (thrice). Nu. ii. 9, 16, 24, 31; xxxiii. 39. So besides only Neh. v. 11 (prob. corrupt). 2 Ch. xxv. 9 Qrê. Est. i. 4.† (Peculiar. P uses מאה in such cases only twice, Gen. xvii. 17; xxiii. 1.)

9. *To expire* (נוע): Gen. vi. 17; vii. 21; xxv. 8, 17; xxxv. 29; xlix. 33. Nu. xvii. 12, 13; xx. 3 bis, 29. Josh. xxii. 20. (Only besides in poetry: Zech. xiii. 8. Ps. lxxxviii. 16; civ. 29. Lam. i. 19; and 8 times in Job.)†

10. *With thee* (*him*, &c.) appended to an enumeration: Gen. vi. 18; vii. 7, 13; viii. 16, 18; ix. 8; xxviii. 4; xlvi. 6, 7. Ex. xxviii. 1, 41; xxix. 21 *bis*. Lev. viii. 2, 30; x. 9, 14, 15 (xxv. 41, 54 עם). Nu. xviii. 1, 2, 7, 11, 19 *bis*. Similarly *after you* (*thee*, &c.) appended to "seed": Gen. ix. 9; xvii. 7 *bis*, 8, 9, 10, 19; xxxv. 12; xlviii. 4. Ex. xxviii. 43. Nu. xxv. 13.

11. *And Noah did* (*so*); *according to*, &c.: Gen. vi. 22: exactly the same form of sentence, Ex. vii. 6; xii. 28, 50; xxxix. 32^{b}; xl. 16. Nu. i. 54; ii. 34; viii. 20; xvii. 11 [Heb. 26]: cf. Ex. xxxix. 43. Nu. v. 4; ix. 5.

12. *This selfsame day* (עצם היום הזה): Gen. vii. 13; xvii. 23, 26. Ex. xii. 17, 41, 51. Lev. xxiii. 14, 21, 28, 29, 30. Dt. xxxii. 48. Josh. v. 11; x. 27 (not P: probably the compiler). Ez. ii. 3; xxiv. 2 *bis*; xl. 1.†

13. *After their families* (למשפחותם-יהם): Gen. viii. 19; x. 5, 20, 31; xxxvi. 40. Ex. vi. 17, 25; xii. 21.[1] Nu. i. (13 times); ii. 34; iii.–iv. (15 times); xi. 10 (JE); xxvi. (16 times); xxix. 12; xxxiii. 54. Josh. xiii. 15, 23, 24, 28, 29, 31; xv. 1, 12, 20; xvi. 5, 8; xvii. 2 *bis*; xviii. 11, 20, 21, 28; xix. (12 times); xxi. 7, 33, 40 (Heb. 38). 1 Sa. x. 21. 1 Ch. v. 7; vi. 62, 63 (Heb. 47, 48, from Josh. xxi. 33, 40).†

14. לכל *as regards all*, with a generalizing force = *namely*, *I mean* (Ewald, § 310a): Gen. ix. 10^{b}.; xxiii. 10^{b}. Ex. xiv. 28 (cf. *v.* 9 וחילו); xxvii. 3, 19 (si vera l.); xxviii. 38; xxxvi. 1^{b}. Lev. v. 3; xi. 26, 42; xvi. 16, 21; xxii. 18. Nu. iv. 27, 31, 32; v. 9; xviii. 4, 8, 9. Ez. xliv. 9. (Prob. a juristic use. Occasionally elsewhere, esp. in Ch.)

[1] The isolated occurrence of this expression in JE does not make it the less characteristic of P. Of course the writer of Ex. xii. 21 was acquainted with the word משפחה, and could use it, if he pleased, in combination with ל. It is the *frequency* of the combination which causes it to be characteristic of a particular author. For the same reason εὐθύς is characteristic of St. Mark's style, notwithstanding the fact that the other evangelists employ it occasionally. The same remark holds good of Nos. 12, 15, 17, 22, 38, 41, &c.

15. *An everlasting covenant :* Gen. ix. 16 ; xvii. 7, 13, 19. Ex. xxxi. 16. Lev. xxiv. 8 ; cf. Nu. xviii. 19 ; xxv. 13.††

16. *Exceedingly* (במאד מאד, not the usual phrase) : Gen. xvii. 2, 6, 20. Ex. i. 7. Ez. ix. 9 ; xvi. 13.†

17. *Substance* (רכוש) : Gen. xii. 5 ; xiii. 6 ; xxxi. 18 ; xxxvi. 7 ; xlvi. 6. Nu. xvi. 32 *end* ; xxxv. 3. Elsewhere (not P) : Gen. xiv. 11, 12, 16 *bis*, 21 ; xv. 14 ; and in Ch. Ezr. Dan. (15 times).†

18. *To gather* (רכש—cognate with "substance") : Gen. xii. 5 ; xxxi. 18 *bis* ; xxxvi. 6 ; xlvi. 6.†

19. *Soul* (נפש) in the sense of *person :* Gen. xii. 5 ; xxxvi. 6 ; xlvi. 15, 18, 22, 25, 26, 27. Ex. i. 5 ; xii. 4, 16 (RV. *man*), 19 ; xvi. 16 (RV. *persons*). Lev. ii. 1 (RV. *one*) ; iv. 2, 27 ; v. 1, 2 ; and often in the legal parts of Lev. Num. (as Lev. xvii. 12 ; xxii. 11 ; xxvii. 2). Nu. xxxi. 28, 35, 40, 46 (in the account of the war with Midian). Josh. xx. 3, 9 (from Nu. xxxv. 11, 15). See also below, No. 25a. A usage not confined to P, but much more frequent in P than elsewhere.

20. *Throughout your (their) generations* (לדרתיכם לדרתם) : Gen. xvii. 7, 9, 12. Ex. xii. 14, 17, 42 ; xvi. 32, 33 ; xxvii. 21 ; xxix. 42 ; xxx. 8, 10, 21, 31 ; xxxi. 13, 16 ; xl. 15. Lev. iii. 17 ; vi. 11 ; vii. 36 ; x. 9 ; xvii. 7 ; xxi. 17 ; xxii. 3 ; xxiii. 14, 21, 31, 41 ; xxiv. 3 ; xxv. 30 (*his*). Nu. ix. 10 ; x. 8 ; xv. 14, 15, 21, 23, 38 ; xviii. 23 ; xxxv. 29.†

21. *Sojournings* (מגורים), with *land :* Gen. xvii. 8 ; xxviii. 4 ; xxxvi. 7 ; xxxvii. 1 ; Ex. vi. 4 ; Ez. xx. 38 ; with *days* : Gen. xlvii. 9 *bis*. Only besides Ps. cxix. 54 ; and rather differently lv. 16. Job xviii. 19.†

22. *Possession* (אחוזה) : Gen. xvii. 8 ; xxiii. 4, 9, 20 ; xxxvi. 43 ; xlvii. 11 ; xlviii. 4 ; xlix. 30 ; l. 13. Lev. xiv. 34 ; xxv. 10–46 ; xxvii. 16, 21, 22, 24, 28. Nu. xxvii. 4, 7 ; xxxii. 5, 22, 29, 32 ; xxxv. 2, 8, 28. Dt. xxxii. 49. Josh. xxi. 12, 39 ; xxii. 4 (D^a), 9, 19 *bis*. Elsewhere only in Ezekiel (xliv. 28 *bis* ; xlv. 5, 6, 7 *bis*, 8 ; xlvi. 16, 18 *ter* ; xlviii. 20, 21, 22 *bis*). Ps. ii. 8 ; 1 Ch. vii. 28 ; ix. 2 (= Neh. xi. 3) ; 2 Ch. xi. 14 ; xxxi. 1.†

23. The cognate verb *to get possessions* (נאחז), rather a peculiar word : Gen. xxxiv. 10 ; xlvii. 27. Nu. xxxii. 30. Josh. xxii. 9, 19.†

24. *Purchase, purchased possession* (מקנה) : Gen. xvii. 12, 13, 23, 27 ; xxiii. 18. Ex. xii. 44. Lev. xxv. 16 *bis*, 51 ; xxvii. 22. (Prob. a legal term. Only besides Jer. xxii. 11, 12, 14, 16.)†

25. *Peoples* (עמים) in the sense of *kinsfolk* [1] (peculiar) :
(*a*) *That soul* (or *that man*) *shall be cut off from his kinsfolk :* Gen. xvii. 14. Ex. xxx. 33, 38 ; xxxi. 14. Lev. vii. 20, 21, 25, 27 ; xvii. 9 ; xix. 8 ; xxiii. 29. Nu. ix. 13.† (In Lev. xvii. 4, 10 ; xviii. 29 ; xx. 3, 5, 6, 18 ; xxiii. 30. Nu. xv. 30 the noun is *singular*.)
(*b*) *To be gathered to one's kinsfolk :* Gen. xxv. 8, 17 ; xxxv. 29 ; xlix. 33. Nu. xx. 24 ; xxvii. 13 ; xxxi. 2. Dt. xxxii. 50 *bis*.†
(*c*) Lev. xix. 16 ; xxi. 1, 4, 14, 15. Ez. xviii. 18 : perhaps Jud. v. 14. Hos. x. 14.†

[1] Properly *father's kin* (Wellh. in the *Gött. Nachrichten*, 1893, p. 480).

26. *Settler* or *sojourner* (תושב): Gen. xxiii. 4 (hence fig. Ps. xxxix. 13. 1 Ch. xxix. 15). Ex. xii. 45. Lev. xxii. 10; xxv. 6, 23 (fig.), 35, 40, 45, 47 *bis*. Nu. xxxv. 15. Also 1 Ki. xvii. 1 (text doubtful).†

27. *Getting, acquisition* (קנין): Gen. xxxi. 18; xxxiv. 23; xxxvi. 6. Lev. xxii. 11. Josh. xiv. 4: cf. Ez. xxxviii. 12 f.; also Pr. iv. 7. Ps. civ. 24; cv. 21.†

28. *Rigour* (פרך): Ex. i. 13, 14. Lev. xxv. 43, 46, 53. Ez. xxxiv. 4.†

29. *Judgments* (שפטים [not the usual word]): Ex. vi. 6; vii. 4; xii. 12. Nu. xxxiii. 4. Ez. v. 10, 15; xi. 9,; xiv. 21; xvi. 41; xxv. 11; xxviii. 22, 26; xxx. 14, 19. Pr. xix. 29. 2 Ch. xxiv. 24.†

30. *Fathers' houses* (= families: בית אבות, or sometimes אבות alone): Ex. vi. 14, 25; xii. 3. Nu. i.–iv. (often); xvii. 2, 3, 6; xxvi. 2; xxxi. 26; xxxii. 28; xxxiv. 14; xxxvi. 1. Josh. xiv. 1; xix. 51; xxi. 1; xxii. 14.

31. *Hosts* (צבאות) of the Israelites: Ex. vi. 26; vii. 4; xii. 17, 41, 51 Nu. i. 3, 52; ii. 3, 9, 10, 16, 18, 24, 25, 32; x. 14, 18, 22, 25, 28; xxxiii. 1.†† (Dt. xx. 9 differently.)

32. *Congregation* (עדה) of the Israelites: Ex. xii. 3, 6, 19, 47; xvi. 1, 2, 9, 10, 22; xvii. 1; xxxiv. 31; xxxv. 1, 4, 20; xxxviii. 25. Lev. iv. 13, 15; viii. 3–5; ix. 5; x. 6, 17; xvi. 5; xix. 2; xxiv. 14, 16. Nu. xiii. 26 *bis*; xiv. 1, 2, 5, 7, 10, 27, 35, 36; xvi. 2, 3, 9 *bis*, 19 *bis*, 21, 22 (Lev. x. 6), 24, 26, 41, 42, 45, 46 [Heb. xvii. 6, 7, 10, 11]; xx. 1, 2, 8 *bis*, 11, 22, 27, 29; xxv. 6, 7; xxxi. 12, 16, 26, 27, 43 (as well as often in the other chapters of Nu. assigned wholly to P); xxxii. 2, 4. Josh. ix. 15, 18 *bis*, 19, 21, 27; xviii. 1; xx. 6, 9; xxii. 12, 16, 17, 18 (Nu. xvi. 22), 20, 30. (Cf. No. 39.) Never in JE or Dt., and rare in the other hist. books: Jud. xx. 1; xxi. 10, 13, 16. 1 Ki. viii. 5 (= 2 Ch. v. 6); xii. 20.

33. *Between the two evenings* (a technical expression): Ex. xii. 6; xvi. 12; xxix. 39, 41; xxx. 8. Lev. xxiii. 5. Nu. ix. 3, 5, 11; xxviii. 4, 8.†

34. *In all your dwellings* (בכל מושבותיכם): Ex. xii. 20; xxxv. 3. Lev. iii. 17; vii. 26; xxiii. 3, 14, 21, 31. Nu. xxxv. 29 (cf. xv. 2; xxxi. 10). Ez. vi. 6, 14.

35. *This is the thing which Jehovah hath commanded:* Ex. xvi. 16, 32; xxxv. 4. Lev. viii. 5; ix. 6; xvii. 2. Nu. xxx. 2; xxxvi. 6.†

36. *A head* (גלגלת lit. *skull*) in enumerations: Ex. xvi. 16; xxxviii. 26. Nu. i. 2, 18, 20, 22; iii. 47. 1 Ch. xxiii. 3, 24.†

37. *To remain over* (ערף: not the usual word): Ex. xvi. 18, 23; xxvi. 12 *bis*, 13. Lev. xxv. 27. Nu. iii. 46, 48, 49.†

38. *Ruler* or *prince* (נשיא), among the Israelites: Ex. xvi. 22; xxxv. 27. Lev. iv. 22. Nu. i. 16, 44; ii., iii., and vii. (repeatedly); iv. 46; x. 4; xiii. 2; xvii. 2, 6 (Heb. 17, 21); xxv. 14, 18; xxxiv. 18–28. Josh. xxii. 14. In JE once only, Ex. xxii. 27: never in Dt. Jud. Sam.: in Kings only 1 Ki. viii. 1, and in a semi-poetical passage, xi. 34. Cf. Gen. xvii. 20; xxiii. 6; xxv. 16; xxxiv. 2. Often in Ez., even of the king.

39 *Rulers* (*princes*) *of* (or *in*) *the congregation:* Ex. xvi. 22; xxxiv. 31. Nu. iv. 34; xvi. 2; xxxi. 13; xxxii. 2. Josh. ix. 15, 18 (cf. *vv.* 19, 21); xxii. 30 (cf. *v.* 32): cf. Nu. xxvii. 2; xxxvi. 1. Josh. xvii. 4.†

40. *Deep rest* (שבתון): Ex. xvi. 23; xxxi. 15; xxxv. 2. Lev. xvi. 31; xxiii. 3, 24, 32, 39 *bis*; xxv. 4, 5.†

41. *According to the command* (lit. *mouth*) *of Jehovah* (על פי יהוה): Ex. xvii. 1; Lev. xxiv. 12; Nu. iii. 16, 39, 51; iv. 37, 41, 45, 49; ix. 18, 20, 23; x. 13; xiii. 3; xxxiii. 2, 38; xxxvi. 5; Josh. xv. 13 (אל); xvii. 4 (אל); xix. 50; xxi. 3 (אל); xxii. 9. Very uncommon elsewhere: Dt. xxxiv. 5b (probably from P: cf. Nu. xxxiii. 38); 2 Ki. xxiv. 3.

42. *Half* (מחצית: not the usual word): Ex. xxx. 13 *bis*, 15, 23; xxxviii. 26. Lev. vi. 13 *bis*. Nu. xxxi. 29, 30, 42, 47. Josh. xxi. 25 (= 1 Ch. vi. 55). Only besides 1 Ki. xvi. 9. Neh. viii. 3. 1 Ch. vi. 46.†

43. מָעַל *to trespass* and מַעַל *trespass* (often combined, and then rendered in RV. *to commit a trespass*): Lev. v. 15; vi. 2 [Heb. v. 21]; xxvi. 40. Nu. v. 6, 12, 27; xxxi. 16. Dt. xxxii. 51. Josh. vii. 1; xxii. 16, 20, 22, 31.†† Ez. xiv. 13; xv. 8; xvii. 20; xviii. 24; xx. 27; xxxix. 23, 26. (A word belonging to the priestly terminology. Never in Jud., Sam., Kgs., or other prophets [except Dan. ix. 7]: and chiefly elsewhere in Ch.)

44. The methodical form of *subscription* and *superscription*: Gen. x. [5], 20, 31, 32; xxv. 16; xxxvi. 19, 20, 30, 31, 40, 43; xlvi. 8, 15, 18, 22, 25. Ex. i. 1; vi. 14, 16, 19b, 25b, 26. Nu. i. 44; iv. 28, 33, 37, 41, 45; vii. 17b, 23b, 29b &c., 84; xxxiii. 1. Josh. xiii. 23b, 28, 32; xiv. 1; xv. 12b, 20; xvi. 8b; xviii. 20, 28b; xix. 8b, 16, 23, 31, 39, 48, 51 [cf. Gen. x. 31, 32]; xxi. 19, 26, 33, 40, 41–42. (Not a complete enumeration).

45. For *tribe* P has nearly always מטה, very rarely שבט; for *to beget* הוליד (Gen. v. 3–32; vi. 10; xi. 11–27; xvii. 20; xxv. 19; xlviii. 6. Lev. xxv. 45. Nu. xxvi. 29, 58), not ילד (as in the genealogies of J: Gen. iv. 18 *ter*; x. 8, 13, 15, 24 *bis*, 26; xxii. 23; xxv. 3); for *to be hard* or *to harden* (of the heart) חזק, חזק lit. *to be* or *make strong* (Ex. vii. 13, 22; viii. 19 [Heb. 15]; ix. 12; xi. 10; xiv. 4, 8, 17), not הכביד, כבד lit. *to be* or *make heavy* (Ex. vii. 14; viii. 15, 32 [Heb. 11, 28]; ix. 7, 34; x. 1); for *to stone* רגם (Lev. xx. 2, 27; xxiv. 14, 16 *bis*, 23. Nu. xiv. 10: xv. 35, 36: also Dt. xxi. 21. Josh. vii. 25a [?P]††), not סקל (Ex. viii. 26 [Heb. 22]; xvii. 4; xix. 13 *bis*; xxi. 28 *bis*, 29, 32. Dt. xiii. 10 [Heb. 11]; xvii. 5: xxii. 21, 24. Josh. vii. 25b††); for *to spy* תור (Nu. xiii. 2, 16, 17, 21, 25, 32 *bis*; xiv. 6, 7, 34, 36, 38; xv. 39: also x. 33 JE, Dt. i. 33 ††), not רגל (Nu. xxi. 32. Dt. i. 24. Josh. ii. 1; vi. 22, 23, 25; vii. 2 *bis*; xiv. 7); and for the pron. of 1 ps. sing. אני[1] (nearly 130 times; אנכי once only,

[1] In Dt., on the contrary, אנכי is regularly employed, except (1) xii. 30 *after* the verb, according to usual custom (*Journ. of Phil.*, 1882, p. 223); (2) xxix. 6 [Heb. 5] in a stereotyped formula (Ex. vii. 17 *al.*); (3) in the *Song*, xxxii. 21, 39 four times; (4) in the passage assigned to P, xxxii. 49, 52,—9 times in all.

Gen. xxiii. 4 : comp. in Ez. אני 138 times, אנכי once xxxvi. 28).[1]

The following geographical terms are found only in P :

46. *Kirjath-Arba* for *Hebron :* Gen. xxiii. 2 ; xxxv. 27. Josh. xv. 13, 54 ; xx. 7 ; xxi. 11. (The same name is referred to, but not used, in Josh. xiv. 15 = Jud. i. 10 JE : see also Neh. xi. 25.)
47. *Machpelah :* Gen. xxiii. 9, 17, 19 ; xxv. 9 ; xlix. 30 ; l. 13.†
48. *Paddan-Aram :* Gen. xxv. 20 ; xxviii. 2, 5, 6, 7 ; xxxi. 18 ; xxxiii. 18 ; xxxv. 9, 26 ; xlvi. 15.† (xlviii. 7 *Paddan* alone. J says *Aram-naharaim* xxiv. 10, as Dt. xxiii. 4 [Heb. 5]. Jud. iii. 8.)
49. *The Desert of Zin* (צן) : Nu. xiii. 21 ; xx. 1a ; xxvii. 14 ; xxxiii. 36 ; xxxiv. 3. Dt. xxxii. 51. Josh. xv. 1 : cf. *Zin*, Nu. xxxiv. 4. Josh. xv. 3.
50. *The Steppes of Moab* (ערבות מואב) : Nu. xxii. 1 ; xxvi. 3, 63 ; xxxi. 12 ; xxxiii. 48-50 ; xxxv. 1 ; xxxvi. 13. Dt. xxxiv. 1, 8. Josh. xiii. 32.†

Eleazar the priest, though not unmentioned in the other sources (Dt. x. 6. Josh. xxiv. 33), is specially prominent in P, esp. after the death of Aaron (Nu. xx. 25–28). as Nu. xxvi. 1 &c. ; xxxi. 12 &c. ; xxxii. 2, 28 ; xxxiv. 17. Josh. xiv. 1 ; xvii. 4 ; xix. 51 ; xxi. 1. The priestly tradition also records incidents in which his son Phinehas (Ex. vi. 25) took part : Nu. xxv. 7, 11 ; xxxi. 6. Josh. xxii. 13, 30–32 (in JE xxiv. 33 ; cf. Jud. xx. 28).

II

List of Passages in the Hexateuch assigned to P

Genesis i. 1–ii. 4a ; v. 1–28, 30–32 ; vi. 9–22 ; vii. 6, 11, 13–16a, 17a (except *forty days*), 18–21, 24 ; viii. 1–2a, 3b–5, 13a, 14–19 ; ix. 1–17, 28–29 ; x. 1–7, 20, 22–23, 31–32 ; xi. 10–27, 31–32 ; xii. 4b–5 ; xiii. 6, 11b–12a ; xvi. 1a, 3, 15–16 ; xvii. ; xix. 29 ; xxi. 1b, 2b–5 ; xxiii. ; xxv. 7–11a, 12–17, 19–20, 26b ; xxvi. 34–35 ; xxvii. 46–xxviii. 9 ; xxix. 24, 29 ;[2] xxxi. 18b ; xxxiii. 18a ; xxxiv. 1–2a, 4, 6, 8–10, 13–18, 20–24, 25 (partly), 27–29 ; xxxv. 9–13, 15, 22b–29 ; xxxvi. ; xxxvii. 1–2a ; xli. 46 ; xlvi. 6–27 ; xlvii. 5–6a (LXX), 7–11, 27b–28 ; xlviii. 3–6, 7 ? ; xlix. 1a 28b–33 ; l. 12–13.

Exodus i. 1–5, 7, 13–14 ; ii. 23b–25 ; vi. 2–vii. 13, 19–20a, 21b–22 ; viii. 5–7, 15b–19 ; ix. 8–12 ; xi. 9–10 ; xii. 1–20, 28, 37a, 40–41, 43–51 ; xiii. 1–2, 20 ; xiv. 1–4, 8–9, 15–18, 21a, 21c–23, 26–27a, 28a, 29 ; xvi. 1–3, 6–24, 31–36 ; xvii. 1a ; xix. 1–2a ; xxiv. 15–18a ; xxv. 1–xxxi. ; 18a ; xxxiv. 29–35 ; xxxv.–xl.

Leviticus i.–xvi. (xvii.–xxvi.), xxvii.

Numbers i. 1–x. 28 ; xiii. 1–17a, 21, 25–26a (to *Paran*), 32a ; xiv. 1–2,[3] 5–7, 10, 26–30, 34–38 ; xv. ; xvi. 1a, 2b–7a (7b–11), (16–17), 18–24,

[1] See further Budde, *ZATW*. 1891, pp. 203 ff. ; Holzinger, pp. 338 ff. ; and the instructive comparative table of the usage of E, J, D, P, H in Strack's *Einleitung* [4] (1895), pp. 42–51.

[2] With perhaps fragments in ch. xxx. 1a, 4a, 9b, 22a. [3] In the main.

27a, 32b, 35 (36–40), 41-50, xvii.–xix.; xx. 1a (to *month*) 2, 3b–4, 6–13, 22–29; xxi. 4a (to *Hor*), 10–11; xxii. 1; xxv. 6–18; xxvi.–xxxi.; xxxii. 18–19, 28–32[1]; xxxiii.—xxxvi.

Deuteronomy i. 3 (largely); xxxii. 48–52; xxxiv. 1a, 5b, 7–9.

Joshua iv. 13, 19; v. 10–12; vii. 1; ix. 15b, 17–21; xiii. 15–32; xiv. 1–5; xv. 1–13, 20–44 (45–47), 48–62; xvi. 4–8; xvii. 1a, 3–4, 7, 9a, 9c–10a; xviii. 1, 11–28; xix. 1–8, 10–46, 48, 51; xx. 1–3 (except '*and* unawares'), 6a (to *judgment*), 7–9 [cf. LXX]; xxi. 1–42 (xxii. 9–34).

[1] With traces in xxxii. 1-17, 20-27.

CHAPTER IV

THE SOURCES J AND E

After the removal of the Priestly sections from the first four books of the Pentateuch, with which subject the last chapter was concerned, there remains in Genesis and Exodus and even in Numbers a considerable residuum that must now receive our attention. That this residuum, usually known as JE, is composite quickly appears when it is carefully examined.

The separation of JE into its component parts J and E is, it is true, not so easy as the separation of P from JE. It is, indeed, recognised on all sides that over some considerable areas the exact lines of demarcation are less distinct than those which, as we have seen, unmistakably mark off P from JE as a whole. Still it is undeniable that definite and convincing marks of composite authorship do clearly obtrude themselves.

The changes in the Divine names, referred to in Ch. II., arrest attention and strongly suggest diversity of authorship.

I am aware that in appealing to the evidence afforded by the names of God I am using a criterion on the validity of which attempts have lately been made to cast much discredit. It has been maintained that nothing can be built on the alternations in the Divine names in Genesis, because in one or more MSS. of the Septuagint, and sometimes also in other Ancient Versions and in Hebrew MSS., there is often found a name different from that in

the Hebrew text. More will be said about this point in the Appendix (pp. 177 ff.); for the present it must suffice to observe that the various readings referred to have not yet been shown[1] to be superior to those of the Hebrew, or to have any claim to be adopted in preference to them. Hence, until such proof has been adduced, the readings of the Hebrew are in possession of the field, and we are not merely justified in dealing with them at the outset of our argument, but are even compelled to do so.

In the abstract, of course, different aspects of the Deity may be emphasised in the two words *God* (*'Elōhīm*) and LORD (Jehovah); but in the Pentateuch at any rate the writers seem to have used them without having *this* purpose in view, except in one or two passages at the most. Hence some other explanation is required with regard to the main mass of alternations of the two terms in the residuum remaining after P has been separated off. The only feasible explanation which has so far been advanced, and one which has been generally approved, is, as just stated, that the occurrence of these sudden changes in the method of referring to the Deity is due to equally sudden changes of authorship.

From ch. xx. of Genesis to Exodus iii. this and other phenomena constantly occur, and their combined force drives us irresistibly to the adoption of the hypothesis that the non-Priestly sections are to be assigned to two distinct sources. For example, in chs. xviii.–xix.,[2] just as in xii. 10–20, LORD (Jehovah) appears uniformly. In ch. xx. 1–17, on the other hand, just as in xxi. 6–31, xxii. 1–13, xl.–xlii., and xlv., we find *God* (*'Elōhīm*). The

[1] The writer is aware of the elaborate attempts that have recently been made to show this; but he agrees with Dr. Skinner that they are unsuccessful (see further the Appendix, pp. 176 ff.).

[2] Except xix. 29, which has unmistakable criteria of P.

sections thus marked by the use of this latter name we are precluded from assigning to P by the fact that none of the other features characteristic of P appear in them. True, other stylistic and phraseological features, distinguishing them from the other non-Priestly sections, are slight, but to a very great extent the same or similar ground is covered in J and in E; and the differences of representation, in addition to the alternations in the Divine appellatives, point to the same conclusion, viz., that there once existed two distinct sources, one using LORD (Jehovah) and the other *God* (*'Elōhīm*). These were united by an author who wished to preserve what was best in each of them, and so welded them into one continuous narrative, from time to time introducing his own explanations and harmonising remarks. Since one of his sources, as we have seen, uses LORD (Jehovah=Jahveh), this source is most usually known as J, *i.e.* the *Jahvistic* narrative. The other source is usually known as E, *i.e.* the *Elohistic* narrative, because, in the sections which have been held to constitute it, the usual Divine appellative up to the solemn revelation of the personal name Jehovah (Ex. iii. 14) is *God* (*'Elōhīm*). From this point onward, though *God* (*'Elōhīm*) is still sometimes used (*e.g.* Ex. xiii. 17–19), the name LORD (Jehovah) predominates in this source also. We are, however, fully justified in recognising these sections as belonging to E on account of the presence in them of other regular and definite characteristics which we have noticed in earlier sections of that document. Hence, even if this criterion of the Divine appellatives did not exist, the analysis, though conceivably less easy, would still be necessary, and over a large part of the area quite as certain.

But there are other marks of composite structure in

JE. One of these is the presence of duplicate accounts of the same event. We have, for instance, two explanations as to the origin of the place-name Beer-sheba. In Gen. xxi. 33 we read: "And *Abraham* planted a tamarisk tree in Beer-sheba, and called there on the name of the LORD, the Everlasting God"; while in xxvi. 33 we read: "And he called it Shibah: therefore the name of the city is Beer-sheba unto this day." Or again, take the two discrepant motives given in Gen. xxx. for the bestowal of the name Issachar. In *v.* 16 Leah tells Jacob that it is given because "I have surely hired thee," whereas in *v.* 18 she says, "God hath given me my hire."[1] So in *v.* 20[a] of the same chapter, another son receives the name Zebulon, because "God hath endowed me with a good dowry,"[2] whereas in *v.* 20[b] this name is bestowed on the ground that "now will my husband dwell with me."[3] So, too, in the case of the much-loved Joseph: his mother bestows this name on him because, as she says (*v.* 23), "God (*'Elōhīm*) hath taken away my reproach,"[4] but in *v.* 24, along with the use of the word LORD (Jehovah), there comes another explanation of this same name: "The LORD (Jehovah) add to me another son."[5] Similarly, if Professor Sayce is to be followed, "tradition has handed down more than one name for the high-priest of Midian. In one part of the narrative in Exodus he is called Reuel, in another part Jethro."[6]

But such duplications and contradictions are found not merely in names or half-verses. In ch. xxvi. we have the story of Isaac's dealings with Abimelech, King of

[1] A play on the Hebrew word *sākār* = hire.
[2] In Syriac *zebed* = dowry.
[3] Hebrew *zābal* = to dwell.
[4] Hebrew *'āsaph* = take away.
[5] Hebrew *yāsaph* = to add.
[6] *The Early History of the Hebrews*, 1897, p. 163.

Gerar, and of his naming of Beer-sheba. But already in ch. xx and in ch. xxi. 22 ff. we have had similar stories of Abraham's dealings with an Abimelech, who here, too, is King of Gerar, and of the naming of Beer-sheba. To quote Professor Sayce once more :—

"In reading the narrative of Isaac's dealings with Abimelech by the side of that of Abraham's dealings with the same king, it is difficult to resist the conclusion that we have before us two versions of the same event. Doubtless, history repeats itself; disputes about the possession of wells in a desert-land can frequently recur, and it is possible that two kings of the same name may have followed one another on the throne of Gerar. But what does not seem very possible is that each of these kings should have had a 'chief captain of his host' called by the strange *non-Semitic name of Phicol* (xxi. 22; xxvi. 26); that each of them should have taken the wife of the patriarch, believing her to be his sister; or that Beer-sheba should twice have received the same name from the oaths sworn over it." [1]

Thus Professor Sayce recognises that, in spite of the differences in detail in this passage, the presence of repetitions and duplications proves conclusively the existence in the Pentateuch of different sources. The differences of detail are in fact "not greater than would naturally arise from the fluctuation of tradition, and from the individual colouring stamped upon each narrative by the narrator." [2]

Let us next take the story of Joseph, in which the compiler who united J and E into a single whole did his work with consummate skill, and ably harmonised the two strands without destroying the distinctive characteristics still observable in each. Here J and E are undoubtedly both discernible, and can be separated from each other with a considerable degree of certainty in details, in spite of the comparatively rare occurrence

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 64. [2] See Driver, *Genesis*, p. 255 *n.* 1.

of either LORD (Jehovah) or *God* (*'Elōhīm*).[1] Taken as a whole, the story, like many another so taken, contains various self-contradictions, which have been the butt of the shallow gibes of the sceptic and of those who would belittle the real abiding worth of the Scriptures. It is urged, and rightly so, that the representation in different parts of the narrative varies. Thus, in ch. xliii., when the brothers report to their father their interview with Joseph, they do not say that Joseph charged them with being spies, but merely that he asked them whether they had a brother (*vv.* 6, 7; *cf.* xliv. 19); whereas in ch. xlii. it is narrated that Joseph's brethren were definitely accused of being spies, and that they themselves volunteered the information, not specifically sought, that they had a *younger* brother (*vv.* 7–13, 30–32). Or earlier still, it is *twice* recorded (xxxvii. 36; xxxix. 1) that Joseph was taken into Egypt and sold there. In one of these cases the slave traders are *Midianites* (xxxvii. 36), while in xxxix. 1 they are *Ishmaelites*. Moreover, that these are not interchangeable terms but relate to two separate caravans appears from the fact that, while in xxxvii. 28[b] Joseph is *sold* to the Ishmaelites, in 28[a] Midianites drew[2] Joseph up from the pit and carried him away *without his brothers' knowledge*, for Joseph himself remarks "I was *stolen* out of the land of the Hebrews" (xl. 15).

But the difficulty lies not merely in the fact that the representation in different parts of the narrative varies. It has been a cause of stumbling to ordinary Christian readers that from time to time in this history of Joseph

[1] In chs. xxxvii., xl.-xlviii., LORD (Jehovah) does not occur at all.

[2] That 'they drew' cannot refer to Joseph's brethren is evident from the fact that Reuben was in their company during this time, yet when he went to the pit he was surprised at not finding Joseph in

there recur isolated statements, which, though brief, none the less clearly presuppose different circumstances from those implied in the contexts in which they are embedded. Thus it is with something of a shock that in xxxvii. 28, after having just been told of the approach of a caravan of Ishmaelites, we read "And there passed by Midianites, merchantmen." This indefinite expression plainly represents the first appearance of merchants upon the scene. Hence this is not the real continuation of *vv.* 25–27, for the sequel to *v.* 25 would have had a

it; *i.e.* it was neither he nor his brothers, but the Midianites mentioned in the preceding sentence, who drew Joseph up. To illustrate the independence of the two narratives and the internal coherence of each of them, it is necessary to print only a few verses:—

J	E
xxxvii.	xxxvii.
25. And they lifted up their eyes and looked, and, behold, a travelling company of Ishmael-	23. And it came to pass, when Joseph was come unto his brethren, that they stript
ites came from Gilead, with their camels bearing spicery	Joseph of his coat, the coat of
and balm and myrrh, going to	many colours that was on
26. carry it down to Egypt. And	24. him; and they took him, and
Judah said unto his brethren,	cast him into the pit: and the
What profit is it if we slay our	pit was empty, there was no
brother and conceal his blood?	25. water in it. And they sat
27. Come, and let us sell him to	28. down to eat bread. And there
the Ishmaelites, and let not our	passed by Midianites, mer-
hand be upon him; for he is	chantmen, and they drew and
our brother, our flesh. And	lifted up Joseph out of the
his brethren hearkened unto	pit, and they brought Joseph
28. him, and sold Joseph to the	into Egypt.
Ishmaelites for twenty pieces of	. . . . .
silver.	. . . . .
xxxix.	. . . . .
1. And Joseph was brought down	
to Egypt; and an Egyptian	
bought him of the hand of the	
Ishmaelites, which had brought	36. And the Midianites sold him
him down thither.	into Egypt unto Potiphar, an
	officer of Pharaoh's, the captain
	of the guard.

definite subject such as " and *the* Ishmaelites drew near." *V.* 28, in short, is not the sequel of *vv.* 25–27 but *parallel* to them. Or again, while xlii. 27 f. (describing the discovery of the returned money at the lodging-place) is in agreement with xliii. 19 f., and while xlii. 35 (describing the discovery of the money in their sacks after their return home) is in agreement with xlii. 25, the presence of xlii. 35 after xlii. 27 f. is amazing. How can the brothers, if they open their sacks *at the lodging-place* and make the discovery *there*, as they do in xlii. 27 f., proceed on their way and only make this discovery, through the same process of opening their sacks, *at home*? Moreover, this strange phenomenon is accompanied by the presence in xlii. 27 f. of a rare Hebrew word (*'amtaḥath*) for 'sack,' different from that (*saq*) which occurs for 'sack' in xlii. 25, 35. On the other hand, this unusual *'amtaḥath* occurs thirteen times in the narrative of chs. xliii.–xliv. There are thus two independent facts distinguishing xlii. 27 f. from its context in ch. xlii., but connecting it with chs. xliii.–xliv. It is a reasonable inference that xlii. 27 f. belongs to a different narrative from the rest of ch. xlii., but to the same narrative as the bulk of chs. xliii.–xliv.

It is beyond the scope of the present volume to state *all* the facts which point to the composite structure of the Joseph-narrative; the reader who desires to know what they are will find them fully stated in larger and readily accessible works.[1] Assuming, however, the analysis to have been made out, we may now reconstruct briefly the two narratives in their original form. In each, it must be remembered, notices really inconsistent with the general tenour of the context, and derived from

[1] *E.g.* Driver, *Introduction*, pp. 17-21, and *Genesis*, pp. 332 f.; also Carpenter and Harford, *op. cit.*, pp. 51 f.

the other, are introduced in the form in which they are presented in the composite document JE.

Throughout the story in J Judah is more to the front, whereas in E Reuben takes the lead. In J the brothers sell Joseph to *Ishmaelites*, instead of murdering him; in E they place Joseph in a cistern at the entreaty of Reuben, who hopes to rescue him when the others' annoyance has passed off, but the plan is frustrated by *Midianites* who hear his cries for help and carry him away. In J his *Ishmaelite* masters sell him to an Egyptian, a private person, nameless, as it happens, in this source, but a married man, whose wife's infamous designs result in Joseph's committal to prison; in E his *Midianite* captors sell him to an Egyptian, by name Potiphar, a eunuch, and in fact an official personage in charge, among other things, of the royal prison. Hence in E Joseph assumes the honourable position of a jailor under Potiphar, and so naturally comes into frequent contact with the prisoners. As earlier in this source he was an accomplished dreamer, so now he is skilled in the interpretation of dreams. Accordingly the interpretation of the prisoners' dreams, and then of Pharaoh's, results in his ultimate advancement to a high position in the Egyptian Court and his alliance by marriage with the priestly caste.

In the sequel the phenomenon of duplications in the story recurs; and it is easy to distinguish between what in all probability belongs to J and what to E. To the former belong the allusions to the interviews with his brothers in which Joseph seems to have questioned them immediately and of his own accord; in E they are represented as spontaneously volunteering their information. To J belongs Joseph's threat that they shall have no more corn unless Benjamin is produced before

him on their next visit; to E the retention of Simeon until Benjamin's production. In J it is at the first station on their journey homeward that to their horror they discover the money that they had handed over for the corn; but in E this discovery does not take place till after they have returned to their father. In conclusion, in J it is Judah who takes the lead in persuading the father (who seems in this source after xxxv. 22 to be most frequently called Israel) to allow Benjamin to be taken to Joseph that they may obtain more corn (xliii. 8, 9); in E Reuben takes upon himself the responsibility of bringing Benjamin back safely (xlii. 37), if only their father (who in this source is by preference called Jacob) will consent to the arrangement with a view to the recovery of Simeon.

The skill with which the compiler combined these two divergent sources, J and E, has also served him in good stead in several sections dealing with the period of Moses.

A careful examination, for instance, of the narrative of the plagues, after the removal of P, reveals similar indications which satisfy all critics that here also we have duplicate narratives. The following extract will suffice to illustrate this :—

"The grounds for believing that what remains in the narrative of the plagues after the separation of P is not perfectly homogeneous, but contains elements due to E, are, stated briefly, as follows. Reasons were given above (p. 23) for concluding that the two verses iv. 17–18, which speak of the *rod* of Moses, were not originally part of the context in which they are now found, and they were assigned accordingly to E. Now, in the narrative of the plagues, the effect in certain cases is brought about not immediately by God, but by the intervention of *Moses' rod* (vii. 17, 20b; ix. 23; x. 13). It is difficult not to connect the passages in which the rod is thus named with iv. 17–18, and to treat both as notices derived

from the same source E. The opinion that the parts of the narrative which remain after the separation of P are to some extent composite, is confirmed by other indications. Thus in vii. 17 the transition from the 'I' of God to the 'I' of Moses is abrupt and (in the historical books) unusual; hence the suspicion arises that originally the subject of *I will smite* was Jehovah (*cf.* *v.* 25b), and that the words 'with the rod that is in mine hand,' were introduced by the compiler of JE from the other source used by him. By the side of ix. 34b, *v.* 35a would seem to be superfluous." [1]

And, as will be shown presently, this conclusion is supported by phraseological differences.

Once more, Pentateuchal criticism should commend itself to all Christians by the fact that in its light the difficulties which so embarrassed the older exegetes to a great extent disappear. In the story of Balaam, for instance, no room is left for the old taunt that the God of the Hebrews is guilty of capricious change of mind and of unjustifiable wrath against Balaam, inasmuch as, after giving his express permission (Num. xxii. 20), He is displeased that Balaam avails himself of it (*v.* 22). For xxii. 22–24 belong to a different source (J) from *v.* 21 (E). In E Balaam goes "with the princes of Moab" (xxii. 21), but in J he is to all appearance alone with his two servants (*v.* 22 f.). In E Balaam has already twice communed with *God* (*'Elōhīm*) and has eventually received His express permission to go, on the understanding that he is to speak only the word which is put into his mouth (*vv.* 9–12, 20). In J the mention of the Divine anger at the outset of his journey, and the miracle of the ass's human utterance, imply that no such permission has been given. We also note in J the tendency to employ anthropomorphic expressions—*e.g.* "the LORD [Jehovah] opened the mouth of the ass," etc., and "the

[1] Driver, *Introduction*, p. 26.

angel of the LORD" (Jehovah), "here identical with" Jehovah.[1]

Now let us look briefly at a few of the characteristics of style, the point of view, and other important matters, peculiar to each of these independent narratives J and E. To LORD (Jehovah) and *God* (*'Elōhīm*) we have already referred, as also to the strikingly different words for the 'sacks' in the story of Joseph. But these do not stand alone. The general name for the inhabitants of Palestine whom the Hebrews conquered is *Amorites* in E, but in J *Canaanites*. J again uses exclusively 'make heavy' (some form of *kābēd*) in the sense of 'harden,' with reference to the hardening of Pharaoh's heart, whereas, in contradistinction from J, E employs the Hebrew root for 'strong' (*ḥāzaq*) to express this same idea. In E we notice some unusual words. In Gen. xxxi., in a section which is on independent grounds assigned to E, there occurs in *vv.* 7, 41 the Hebrew word *mōnīm* (='times') which is found nowhere else in the whole of the Old Testament. Similarly the word for 'wages' (xxxi. 7, 41) occurs again in the Pentateuch only in Gen. xxix. 15, which also belongs to E, and outside the Pentateuch only in Ruth ii. 12. Again the word *ḳesīṭāh*, denoting a piece of money, is found in the E sections in Gen. xxxiii. 19, Joshua xxiv. 32, and besides only in Job xlii. 11. So the otherwise rare and poetical *ḥādāh* (='to rejoice') occurs in the Pentateuch only in Ex. xviii. 9. The verb *ḥāzāh* (='to see'), very uncommon in prose, occurs in E in Ex. xviii. 21. In Ex. xxxii. 18 we have the only occurrence of the form *ḥalūshāh*, and in *v.* 25 of the same chapter the poetical expression "for a whispering among them that rose up

[1] G. Buchanan Gray, *Numbers*, 1893, *ad loc.*; *cf.* especially Kautzsch, *H. D. B.*, extra vol., p. 638.

against them." Observe, too, the peculiar forms of the infinitive in Gen. xxxi. 28, xlvi. 3, xlviii. 11, l. 20.

Turning now to J, we will note a few of the characteristics found in the sections assigned to him. There is the beautiful phrase "call by the name of the LORD (Jehovah)" in Gen. iv. 26, xii. 8, xiii. 4, xxi. 33, xxvi. 25, but found nowhere else in the whole of the Pentateuch or Joshua; or again the picturesque "Behold now" in Gen. xii. 11, xvi. 2, xviii. 27, 31, xix. 2, 8, 19, xxvii. 2, but found nowhere else in the Pentateuch or Joshua. Once more, take the phrase "he (was) the father of . . ." occurring in Gen. iv. 20, 21, xix. 37, 38, but not elsewhere in the Pentateuch or Joshua. Or take the phrase which we noted above on p. 53, "to find favour in the eyes of," which occurs fourteen times even in Genesis alone. Again the expression "forasmuch as," a peculiar one in Hebrew, occurs in Gen. xviii. 5, xix. 8, xxxiii. 10, xxxviii. 26, Num. x. 31, xiv. 43, but nowhere else in the Pentateuch or Joshua.

Moreover, quite apart from these and other words and expressions characteristic of E as distinguished from J, or of J as distinguished from E, there are numerous other cases in which J and E each exhibit a very decided predilection for particular words or phrases. No one wishes to maintain that these are so strongly marked as P's preference for particular words or phrases, but everyone must admit at any rate the existence in J and E of indisputable cases of preference. Moreover, the repeated recurrence in one narrative more than in the other of words that in themselves may be quite insignificant is a phenomenon which must be taken into account by everyone who wishes to judge fairly and comprehensively.[1]

[1] For full lists of these and other criteria see Carpenter and Harford, *op. cit.*, pp. 384-91.

There are also characteristic differences in subject matter which are both instructive and interesting, and which must not be overlooked.

E, for example, often goes into greater detail respecting the facts of history than does J. Especially is this the case in regard to matters relating to Egypt, as was probably suggested to the reader by the story of Joseph detailed above, and as is again evident for instance in E's treatment of Moses' early life in Egypt. In the former case we notice, for instance, some Egyptian words —such as that for the Nile-grass—and the Egyptian names Potiphar, Zaphenath-paneah, Asenath. These names, however, are not early forms, as all the best Egyptologists agree.[1] Hence, so far from supporting the traditional belief in the Mosaic authorship, they show that they constitute some of the *latest* elements in the traditions incorporated in E. In short, Archæology clearly supports the view, pressed upon us by other considerations, that the traditions forming the basis of E long remained in a fluid *oral* state—the state which best of all ministers to healthy religious advance—and did not assume their final form till a time probably somewhat later than that of J, somewhere about 750–30 B.C. Moreover, Hosea bears witness to the pro-Egyptian tendencies which were at that time at work in influential circles, especially in Northern Israel, and which would therefore fully explain the interest in such matters reflected in these narratives of

[1] *E.g.* Brugsch, Ebers, Steindorff (see *H. D. B.*, vol. ii., p 775a), W. M. Müller (*Enc. Bib.*, art. POTIPHERA), F. Ll. Griffith (*H. D. B.*, art. ZAPHENATH-PANEAH), W. E. Crum (*H. D. B.*, vol. i., p. 665b), Spiegelberg in the *Zeitschrift fur Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde*, vol. xlii., pp. 84 f. (for Zaphenath-paneah), H. R. Hall, *The Ancient History of the Near East*, 1913, pp. 405 f. For the reasons why the Egyptian *words* are not evidence for the Mosaic authorship, see Driver, *Introduction*, pp. 125 f.

E. Again, E mentions Joseph's adoption of the habit of shaving, which was practised by the learned circles to which he had now obtained an entry.[1] Note, too, the pictures, true in detail to Egyptian life, of the butler and the baker discharging their specific duties.[2] This trait, however, seems to be almost entirely lacking in J in the stories of Joseph and of Moses alike.

Those bold anthropomorphisms which had made Jehovah's protecting presence so real to previous generations still survive prominently in J. Only the naïve faith and outlook of the Jahvistic narrator could reverently contemplate the thought of a Jehovah who, for instance, stooped to "take off" the chariot-wheels of the Egyptians. Words and phrases embodying a similar conception of the Deity have already been instanced in the case of the stories of Creation and of the Flood, as essentially characteristic of the ancient narrative, which in both those sections belongs clearly and solely to J, in contradistinction to the picture of the transcendent Deity drawn by P.[3] As far back as the days of Enosh the LORD (Jehovah) had revealed this sacred name to men—for how otherwise could they have begun "to call upon" it? Repeatedly the LORD (Jehovah) "comes down," either to inspect mortals' misdeeds (Gen. xi. 5, xviii. 21) or to secure still closer friendly contact with His own people (Ex. iii. 8, xix. 11, 18, 20, xxxiv. 5). It is consequently He Who joins in a physical manner in combat with the wrestling Jacob (Gen. xxxii. 24 ff.), Who confronts Moses at the burning bush, or Himself seeks to slay the uncircumcised Moses when He meets him at the inn (Ex. iv. 24).

[1] *Cf.* Skinner, *Genesis*, note on xli. 14.

[2] See *H. D. B.*, vol. ii., pp. 772-5, where the Egyptian allusions in Genesis are fully discussed; Skinner, *op. cit.*, notes on xl. 9-11, 16.

[3] See pp. 49 f., 54 f., above.

J's religious outlook seems therefore to reflect a point of view dating almost from the people's very beginnings —the period which started with the comparatively limited realisation of the eternal moral and religious truths communicated to Moses, kept alive, as they were, amid the dangerous years of the settlement in Canaan, and becoming more real in the religion of a David, and in the efforts of the prophets of earliest days to recall the people to a sense of their obligations to the LORD (Jehovah), as being alike their War-God, and their real God in the truest sense of the term as they understood it.

Now turn to E and note the methods by which such primitive helps to religion are in this document more or less transformed to meet the requirements of the generation of good men out of which the first ' writing ' prophets, such as Amos and Hosea, ultimately sprang.

The space devoted in E, for example, to dreams in the cases of Joseph and Balaam is paralleled by the emphasis which, in a number of sections attributed, on independent grounds, to E, is laid on *dreams* and *visions* as a mode of communication from God (*cf.* Gen. xv. 1, xx. 3, xxxi. 24, xlvi. 2). The same characteristic emphasis on visions, and particularly on the prophet's enjoying, through these and other means, more immediate, or at least non-materially mediated, communion with God, appears in Gen. xx. 7, where Abraham is called a ' prophet.' Similarly in Ex. xv. 20 the prophetic function is to the front in the case of Miriam. It is conferred even on Eldad and Medad, in connection with whom Moses expresses his noble aspiration that *all* Jehovah's people should be prophets (Num. xi. 25–29 ; *cf.* xii. 6).

In Gen. xxii. Abraham, at the command of *God* (*'Elōhīm*), as it seemed to him in the light of the age in which he lived, prepares to offer up Isaac. Afterwards he is

told by an angel that, in contrast with the views held, as history shows, by neighbouring tribes, about their own gods, Jehovah, Abraham's God, had no pleasure in *human* sacrifice—a striking anticipation of the sublime message of Micah vi. Thus the narrative of E stands on the threshold of the era of Amos and Hosea, through the latter of whom God declared in His own good time "I desire loving-kindness and not sacrifice, and the knowledge of God more than burnt-offerings." [1]

Thus, while J had apparently reached its final form and was enshrined in writing about 800 B.C., E continued to reflect the progress of the religious consciousness of the Hebrew religion in its highest forms up to about 740 B.C. To assert this is not, however, as some opponents of the critical view appear to think, to deny the antiquity of the traditions which these documents enshrine—traditions which, humanly speaking, would have been lost, had they not been written down and preserved in this manner in either J or E, or both of them. Such, at any rate, were the methods by which God in His providence chose to preserve these stories that they might gradually win ever new appreciation, and might each independently have its various messages and religious values not only for the Jewish Church of old, but also for the Christian Church of to-day.

As regards the *origin* of these documents, J, it would appear, represents the stream of tradition as it was crystallised into a written document in the *Southern* or *Judæan* kingdom at the date we have already suggested. E, on the other hand, reflects the atmosphere of the *Northern* Monarchy not only, as shown above, in the details which it assimilated late in its course (*e.g.* the emphasis on *visions*, derived from the circles of Amos and

[1] Hos. vi. 6.

Hosea), but also in small, but none the less significant, details of the stories of ancient days, which in their broad outlines held their own in the North as tenaciously as in the South.

Several of the traits which point to J's Judæan connection are continued in some of the narratives to which reference has already been made in this chapter. It is natural that, in the case of traditions relating to the ancestors of the tribes, the forms which they assumed should be differently coloured in the Northern and the Southern kingdoms. In J, for instance, as we have seen, Judah is throughout the leader among Joseph's brothers (xliii. 8, 9, xliv. 14 ff.). Further, the Judæans' relations with the Northern kingdom were rarely anything but hostile, or at best those of an armed truce. This being the case, it is noticeable that in the traditions recorded in J it is their ancestor Judah who proposes (xxxvii. 26 f.) that Joseph, the honoured ancestor of the most influential northern tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh, should undergo the humiliating experience of being sold by the Southerners' ancestors as a slave. In the Northern narrative E, on the other hand, Judah is no longer even the leader of the brothers whether for good or for bad; it is Reuben, a Northern tribal ancestor, who has the primacy (xxxvii. 22–24, 28–31; xlii. 37). And from the outset he seeks to save Joseph from the brothers' envy by consigning him to a pit for the time being. The same reverence for Joseph's memory appears in the care with which, again in E, and only in E, his fellow-countrymen carry Joseph's bones away with them on their departure from Egypt (Gen. l. 25; Ex. xiii. 19; *cf.* Josh. xxiv. 32).

Of other significant characteristics which point to J's Judæan descent and E's Northern origin the following

only need be mentioned. The stories of the Patriarchal period which are most intimately bound up with the sacred spots and associations of the *Southern* kingdom appear most fully in J. It is in this source that, in the instance quoted above, the Patriarch Abraham dwells at Hebron, the ancient Judæan capital (2 Sam. ii. 11, v. 5; *cf.* xv. 7); whereas in E is emphasised his connection with Beer-sheba, a place of especial interest to Northerners, and, as Amos tells us (Am. v. 5), a sanctuary much frequented by them (*cf.* 1 Ki. xix. 3). The genealogies of Joktan, Keturah, Ishmael, Esau all occur in J, not in E; and owing to the geographical situation of the peoples descended from them, they were of far greater interest to the Southern kingdom than to the Northern. Of Jacob's relations with Esau, the founder of the Edomite race, again, J has more to say than E—a feature quite explicable if J belongs to Judah, which abutted on Edomite territory and had constant military and political dealings—mostly unfriendly—with that particular neighbour. Again, J's narrative in Gen. xxxviii., unsavoury though it be to modern readers, would have a peculiar interest for the Southerner, since it would explain to him much as to the origin of some of the principal Judæan clans.

But to go deeper than this, and to inquire whether it was when both were co-existent either on Northern or on Southern territory that these differing traditions of J and E as to the distant past began to diverge from each other, is definitely to step off the plane of assured facts into the uncertain domain of speculation and theory. No critic would place such speculations on the same plane as either of the two great and incontrovertible conclusions to which a dispassionate examination of the narrative itself has so far led us, viz., the separation of

P from JE, and in a number of cases the resolution of the latter into its two component strands, J and E. I say, *in a number of cases*; for every critic recognises that the intertwining of these sources, which are in any case not so different from each other as are P and JE, has often been so close as to make their definite and certain separation in some details an impossible task. Wellhausen himself was fully conscious of this; for he ended his study of the composition of the Hexateuch with the words—

"I have here frequently followed untrodden paths, and am far from imagining that I have everywhere arrived at secure results." [1]

And again in 1891, in the first edition of his *Introduction to the Old Testament*, Dr. Driver wrote:—

"In the *details* of the analysis of JE there is sometimes uncertainty, owing to the criteria being indecisive, and capable, consequently, of divergent interpretation." [2]

Kuenen, Budde and other critics, both Continental and English, have frequently expressed themselves with similar reserve in relation to the separation of the more closely interwoven narratives of J and E.[3]

In conclusion let us emphasise once more the fact that JE, and therefore J and E separately, contain some of the most ancient of the nation's traditional beliefs. Here we find the ancient 'Book of the Covenant.' The civil and criminal laws incorporated in this collection reflect, it seems clear,[4] some of the provisions of the

[1] *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, 1877, p. 479 (= *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, ii., 1885, p. 208).

[2] p. 12 (edd. 7–9, p. 14); *cf.* pp. 110 f. (edd. 7–9, pp. 116 f.); pp. 17 f. (edd. 7–9, p. 19).

[3] *Cf.* G. Buchanan Gray, *op. cit.*, pp. 43 f.

[4] See Driver, *Exodus*, pp. 418–25

now famous Code of Hammurabi (*c.* 2100 B.C.), and therefore go back in their origin to a period earlier even than that of Moses. They belong to the circle of consuetudinary and judicial ideas with which the Hebrews became acquainted, possibly before their migration into Egypt, possibly in the early years of their settlement in Canaan after the Exodus from Egypt.[1] In any case, through the Canaanites, or through some similar medium, such Babylonian ideals in the legislative sphere entered into the very soul of the people, and became part of the common stock of Hebrew tradition upon such points.

So too with regard to many of the traditions of the prehistoric period. Babylonian ideas as to the origin of the world, the Flood, and similar matters, filtered through the medium of the Canaanites into the common and universal thought of the Hebrew people. In short, it is not the writer who in the eighth century B.C. committed J to writing who is responsible for the close resemblance of such narratives in J to the literary remains which now survive of the ancient Babylonian ideas upon these same points. No more is the priestly writer responsible for the points of resemblance in Gen. i. to the Babylonian Epics of Creation. To the priestly writer, on the contrary, belong rather those characteristics which most strongly differentiate that Hebrew story of Creation from all Babylonian counterparts.

The same is no less true with regard to both the J and the P stories of the Flood. Both narratives, particularly in those respects in which they differ least from one another, mirror the ordinary common and widely diffused traditions of the Hebrew people with regard to that

[1] *Cf.* C. F. Burney, *Journal of Theological Studies*, April 1908, pp. 321-52; and Driver, *Exodus*, pp. 428 f.

event. Such traditions in their origin go back through the medium of the Canaanites to the general stock of Semitic folk-lore, particularly as moulded by Babylonian influences. The fact that J has even closer resemblances than P to the cuneiform records of those Babylonian traditions which we still possess is an argument in favour of the critical position that J reflects an earlier stage of current Hebrew traditions than that embodied in P. The fact that J and P in such respects resemble each other only proves that P also, though writing at a later period, utilised the old traditions current amongst his people in order to make them the vehicle of the fuller and higher religious and moral truths vouchsafed to his generation and enshrined in his system.[1] Thus Archæology once again proves to be the handmaid of Criticism, while those who "have little reason to be grateful to the spade and the decipherer" are not the critics but their opponents.

[1] We can now see the correct and legitimate rejoinder which we are logically bound to make to Dahse's dilemma (borrowed from Professor Sayce) "that either the Babylonian account contained already both a J and a P, or that modern criticism is entirely on the wrong track" (*S.P.C.K.* translation, p. 20). If the composite narrative of the Flood which we have in our Bibles to-day arose in the manner indicated above, the marvel surely would be if both its component parts—derived, as both are, from a story containing Babylonian features—did *not* exhibit resemblances with the Babylonian narrative. See also A. T. Chapman, *op. cit.*, pp. 311 f., where a refutation will be found of the argument as stated by Professor Sayce in *The Early History of the Hebrews*, 1897, pp. 125 f.: of course the 'third alternative' referred to, and declared not to exist, is the same, *viz.*, that there were two complete narratives of the Flood, by different writers, out of which the present narrative was formed by extracts from both, combined together by a compiler.

With regard to Archæology in relation to Pentateuchal Criticism in general, see above, pp. 35–40.

CHAPTER V

DEUTERONOMY

DEUTERONOMY is of central importance in the criticism of the Pentateuch. The fact that the date of the promulgation of its legislation has been fixed to a year, the fact that the source from which many of its legislative precepts were drawn still exists, and the fact that the prophets whose inspiration and lofty genius are reproduced in it can still be read to-day, all combine to make it an important landmark. From such a landmark we can work backward to the period and the point of view which preceded its composition, and forward to the period when further prophetic activity, together with the doctrinal and ethical advance consequent upon it, resulted in the promulgation of a still more comprehensive code of legislation.

The contents of Deuteronomy, its date and its aims, are therefore of vital importance to us at this particular point. For we have already examined the independent characteristics of P and JE, and even of J and E, in the other four books of the Pentateuch; and we are about to press forward to a consideration of the relations of each of these to the history of the people among whom they arose (Ch. VI.). Moreover, on the basis of all these independent lines of evidence it is hoped to show what in its broad outlines was the gradual process by which, after His initial act of special condescension at Sinai-

Horeb, God led up to the full revelation of Himself in the Incarnation.

Fortunately the lengthy treatment which Deuteronomy should otherwise receive here is rendered unnecessary by the publication in 1912 of Dr. McNeile's *Deuteronomy: Its Place in Revelation*. As long ago as 1895 an exhaustive and practically final treatment of Deuteronomy was published by Dr. Driver in the form of a commentary with an introduction which dealt with all questions really pertinent to the subject.[1] But Dr. McNeile's book, avoiding as it does all details unnecessary for our present purpose, published at a popular price which puts it within easy reach of everyone, and dealing once for all with certain recent misunderstandings of the critical position, justifies the present writer in severely limiting this chapter, so far as is possible, to a statement of the results accruing from the labours of scholars with regard to Deuteronomy. The reader, therefore, is strongly advised to consult Dr. McNeile's handy little volume. For, with this carefully reasoned work so readily obtainable, conclusions will for the most part be stated in this chapter without the addition in every case of the grounds which make them imperative.

The compiler of Deuteronomy goes to some pains to make it clear to his readers that his book was not written by Moses.[2] If his intentions had been of the fraudulent

[1] Attention may also be called to *Deuteronomy and Joshua* in the *Century Bible*, the article DEUTERONOMY in *H. D. B.* by H. E. Ryle, formerly Bishop of Winchester, and to Dr. George Adam Smith's *Deuteronomy*, about to be published in the *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*.

[2] That Moses nowhere in the Pentateuch claims to be the author of *any* of the five Pentateuchal books is so obvious that it has not seemed necessary to demonstrate it in detail in the two preceding chapters (*cf.* also p. 22, *n.* 3 above).

nature ascribed to him by certain anti-critics[1] he might easily have put it forward as a work written throughout by Moses in the first person. On the contrary, Moses is spoken of at the very outset (i. 1–5) *in the third person.*[2] So again in iv. 41–43, 44–49; v. 1^a; xxvii. 1, 9, 11; xxix. 1; xxxi. 1, 2^a, 9, 10^a, $14–23^a$, 24, 25, 30; xxxii. 44, 45, 48; xxxiii. 1; xxxiv.[3]

After specifying *where* and *when* he believes Moses to have uttered the opening discourse, the author proceeds in i. 6–iv. 40 to give the discourse itself. As later in the book further discourses are ascribed to Moses, this one will be most conveniently termed the First Mosaic Discourse. It takes the form of an exhortation to Israel, earnestly pleading with them at last to recognise as immutable truths the spirituality, the essentially moral nature, and the grandeur of the sole Godhead of Jehovah (iv. 1–40). To convince his hearers that they above all nations should gratefully and entirely recognise these attributes of their bounteous Benefactor, the writer prefixes to his exhortation a historical retrospect designed to throw into relief the wonderful kindness and protection which—in spite of all the provocation they have offered to Him during those tedious forty years (i. 6–iii. 22)—Jehovah has consistently extended to them from the time of their arrival at Horeb to the moment when the discourse is delivered in the plains of Moab.

After a digression to emphasise the fact that Moses himself set apart certain cities of asylum (iv. 41–43), the

[1] The dilemma "*either* Mosaic *or* a forgery" is shown to be unreal by Dr. McNeile (*Deut.*, pp. 39 ff.).

[2] Of course this is not proof, and is not alleged as proof, that Moses did *not* write Deuteronomy, but it closes the door to the assumption that he claims to have written it, or that he *must* have written it. See Dr. McNeile's lucid statement, *Deut.*, p. 10.

[3] See McNeile, *Deut.*, pp. 8–11.

separation of which—though only later in this book (xix. 1–13)—is enjoined as a part of Israel's criminal code, the author proceeds to introduce Moses' Second, and, so far as this book is concerned, main, Discourse. As before, he states *where* and *when* he believes it to have been delivered (iv. 44–49).

After this superscription, the new Discourse, like the first one, commences with a retrospect (chs. v.–xi.), developing the significance of the first two of the Ten Commandments, and illustrating this more particularly from the events of the Exodus. Their supreme importance, demonstrated by the grandeur of that initial Theophany at Horeb—so runs the argument—should predispose the chosen race willingly to accept, and actually to live up to, the new series of "statutes and judgments" now to be expounded.

Accordingly in chs. xii.–xxvi. these new "statutes and judgments" are set forth. A note in xxix. 1 rightly insists on their essential character as *supplementary* to "the covenant which He made with them in Horeb," *i.e.* chiefly the 'Book of the Covenant.'[1] The note reads: "These are the words of the covenant which the LORD commanded Moses to make with the children of Israel in the land of Moab beside"—that is, supplementing, reaffirming, changing, expanding, and so, it may be at times, in particular cases, annulling the minutiæ of —"the covenant which He made with them in Horeb."

Again, as in iv. 41–43, a digression, once more *in the third person*, is made in ch. xxvii., which, like that earlier digression, has no connection with the immediate context. It describes injunctions given by Moses to the nation, commanding it, after its entry into Canaan, to bind itself by a solemn ceremony, to be performed on

[1] For this name and the extent of this code see p. 58 above.

the top of Ebal and Gerizim, to the terms of the Deuteronomic Covenant.

Ch. xxviii. is, therefore, the immediate sequel to xii.–xxvi. In the latter has been detailed Israel's duty as a party to the covenant; in this chapter Jehovah binds Himself to do His part, namely, (*a*) to bestow upon Israel every possible kind of blessing, provided that the nation performs its side of the bond (*vv.* 1–14), and (*b*) to correct Israel by means of material misfortunes in the case of, and in proportion to the extent of, its failure to perform its obligations (*vv.* 15–68).[1]

In xxix. 2–xxx. the compiler of Deuteronomy has preserved another — supplementary — Mosaic exhortation, which, in view of the two preceding ones, may be briefly termed the Third Discourse. Once more an appeal is made to Israel to express its gratitude to Jehovah, while a lurid picture is added of the nation's Exile as a punishment for its failure to respond to His claims (xxix. 2–29). It is followed by a homily on (*a*) the saving power of repentance even after the people's misdemeanours have resulted in the Exile (xxx. 1–10), and (*b*) the necessity, nevertheless, of their choosing *at this moment* between life and good on the one hand and death and evil on the other hand, alternatives that the speaker dramatically visualises for them (xxx. 11–20).

But while this impressive final appeal ends the Third Discourse, the Book of Deuteronomy does not close without a somewhat lengthy Appendix, consisting of a number of heterogeneous elements loosely strung together. They may be briefly analysed as follows:[2]—

xxxi. 1–8. Moses' last words of encouragement to the people and to Joshua.

[1] The existence of similar conclusions to the 'Book of the Covenant' and to the 'Law of Holiness' have already been noticed on p. 63 above.

[2] *Cf.* Driver, *Deuteronomy*, p. ii.

xxxi. 9–13. Moses' delivery of the Deuteronomic law to the Levitical priests, with instructions for it to be read publicly every seven years.
xxxi. 14–15, 23. Commission of Joshua by Jehovah.
xxxi. 16–22, 24–30; xxxii. 1–43, 44. The Song of Moses, with accompanying notices.
xxxii. 45–47. Moses' final commendation of the Deuteronomic law to Israel.
xxxii. 48–xxxiv. 12. Conclusion of the whole book, containing the Blessing of Moses (*c.* xxxiii.), and narrating the circumstances of his death.

Even if the preceding chapters are for the moment regarded as a unity, this Appendix clearly lies outside the general plan of the book. Its heterogeneous character is also very obvious. The early recognition of the impossibility of Moses' writing the carefully worded report in ch. xxxiv. of his own death and burial has already been referred to.[1] The so-called 'Song' and 'Blessing' of Moses are related to each of the three Discourses even less closely than is the rest of the Appendix. In fact, they stand quite apart by themselves, and only a brief statement need be made with regard to them.

The 'Song' (Deut. xxxii.) opens (*vv.* 1–4) with a pæan of praise, and celebrates Jehovah's righteousness and justice, two attributes of the Godhead which, as we shall see, Amos so distinctively emphasised. The condemnation of Israel's ungrateful conduct to their "Father" in *vv.* 5, 6 is followed in *vv.* 7–12 by an impassioned survey of Jehovah's protecting care for them in the far-off days of the desert wanderings and of their subsequent entry into Canaan. Hence the 'Song' must have been written long after the Exodus, which, from the poet's standpoint, belongs "to the days of old," an event, in fact, divided from his own day by "many generations,"

[1] See p. 22 f.

which had kept alive the remembrance of it by handing it down in oral form from father to son (see *v.* 7). In *vv.* 13–18 the poet describes Israel's apostacy from Jehovah, and its delight in idolatry, in spite of His manifold gifts to them since their settlement in Canaan —fertility of the soil and prolific flocks. Thus again, so far from Moses being the author, our poet writes long after the settlement of Israel in Canaan, and in fact, as the theological standpoint and the literary affinities show, in the age of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. In *vv.* 19–30 the poet describes the considerations which led Jehovah to refrain from His intention of annihilating them by a combination of all the destructive agencies known to antiquity. This intention of Jehovah's, however, like His decision to abandon it, belongs to a period earlier than the poet's own. Next, in *vv.* 31–34, he rejoices in the thought of the superabundant wickedness of their foe. For, as he states in *vv.* 35–42, this must all result in the destruction of that foe, in Jehovah's ultimate suppression of His indignation against His own people, and in the renewal of His protecting zeal for "His servants." The 'Song,' in both thought and style, has many affinities with Jeremiah and other writers of his age, and thus its most probable date seems to be "the latter half of the seventh century, the enemies being, in that case, the Chaldæans."[1]

The 'Blessing' is no less clearly the product of an age long subsequent to that of Moses. In the first place it is dependent upon, and therefore later than, the Blessing of Jacob (Gen. xlix.), which in its turn presupposes the Song of Deborah. Even if the comparatively early date ("the age of the Judges or a little later") to which

[1] The reader should refer to the careful examination of the literary and historical evidence in McNeile, *Deut.*, pp. 124–8.

Dr. Driver, for instance, assigns the Blessing of Jacob, is correct, the 'Blessing' of Moses was written at the earliest some short time after the ten tribes had broken away from the Davidic monarchy, to which Judah still clung. The poet is a Northerner who hopes for the ultimate reunion of Judah with his own more powerful Northern fatherland (*v.* 7).[1] The tribe of Reuben, the decadence of which was emphasised in Gen. xlix. 3, 4, is now almost non-existent (*v.* 6); and Simeon, whose annihilation is mentioned in Gen. xlix. 5 ff., is here passed over in silence. But Levi, which in Gen. xlix. 5 ff. was a secular tribe and a participant in Simeon's crimes and punishment, is here transformed into the priestly caste, thus represented as having attained to the dignity which we know it to have possessed, at least from the time of the disruption. Other tribes, too, have advanced in importance. The buoyant *resumé* of Northern prosperity and national aggrandisement in the Epilogue (*vv.* 26–29) seems to point with greatest probability to the prosperous days of Jeroboam II. Finally, the 'Blessing' has even less semblance than the 'Song' of approximation to the special characteristics and style of Deuteronomic compositions.[2]

The Appendix (Deut. xxxi.–xxxiv.), therefore, including both the 'Song' and the 'Blessing,' is most emphatically not the work of Moses himself. The author throughout speaks of Moses in the third person, and does not even in appearance make any claim to be a contemporary of his.

And now what of the beginning of the book? Ch. i. 1–5 has been mentioned already. But with which of the

[1] "Hear, LORD, the voice of Judah, and bring him in unto his people."

[2] See further Driver, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 385–417.

chief Pentateuchal sources, JE or P—both of which, be it remembered, purport to cover the same period—do the historical retrospects of the First Discourse (i. 6–iii. 29) and of the Second Discourse (ix. 8–x. 11) show definite affinities, and with which do they show no affinities at all?

A comparison of these Deuteronomic summaries with Exodus and Numbers shows conclusively that they are based upon JE, and not upon P. Whole passages are excerpted from Exodus and Numbers: they agree *verbatim* with JE, but never with P. A single instance of this close following by our author of JE will suffice:—

Ex. xxxii. 7, 8.	Deut. ix. 12.
And Jehovah spake unto Moses, saying, Go, get thee down, for thy people, which thou hast brought up out of Egypt, hath done corruptly: they are quickly turned aside out of the way which I commanded them: they have made them a molten calf.	And Jehovah said unto me, saying, Arise, get thee down quickly from here; for thy people, which thou hast brought forth out of Egypt, hath done corruptly: they are quickly turned aside out of the way which I commanded them: they have made them a molten image.

When the same incident is recorded in both JE and P, Deuteronomy always follows JE, never P. For example, reference is made in Deut. i. 8 to God's promises to Abraham, but the *oath* to which Deuteronomy refers is recorded only in the passages assigned to JE (*e.g.* Gen. xxii. 16 f.; *cf.* xxiv. 7; xxvi. 3 f.). Horeb, as in E, is the only name employed in Deuteronomy for the sacred mount (i. 2, 6, 19; iv. 10, 15; v. 2; ix. 8; xviii. 16; xxix. 1), whereas P uses Sinai.

That JE and P were not as yet united into a single compilation is demonstrated by the fact that, "even

when (as is sometimes the case) JE and P cross each other repeatedly in the course of a few verses, the retrospect in Deuteronomy follows uniformly the parts belonging to JE, and avoids those belonging to P." In the story of the spies, for instance, the varying details of which, on quite independent grounds, have already been distributed between JE and P,[1] the author of Deuteronomy, in every detail which he mentions and upon which JE and P disagree, invariably agrees with JE and disagrees with P.[2] Again, for example, Deuteronomy omits to mention Korah, but speaks of Dathan and Abiram; it is the latter pair who are found in J, while Korah belongs to P. But if the reader will look up this and similar passages, even in his Revised Version, and will underline the words in common, he will be able to observe for himself how closely the Deuteronomist has followed those passages which, by the application of the principles enunciated above in Chapter III., and on grounds which were quite irrespective of the present problem, have already been assigned to JE and not to P.[3]

The reader who will also be at the trouble to go into other instances will observe for himself still more fully what purpose the writer of these historical retrospects

[1] See above, p. 58.

[2] Notice especially how at i. 40 (= Num. xiv. 25) the retrospect passes in i. 41 to Num. xiv. 40, omitting the intervening verses (*vv.* 26–39)—just those which belong in the main to P.

[3] See the examples printed *in extenso* in Driver, *Deuteronomy*, pp. viii, ix, 10, 19, 24 ff., 113 f., 117, 164, 192, 194, 196–8, 249.

The mention of *twelve* as the number of the spies (i. 23) and of *seventy* as that of Jacob's fellow-travellers into Egypt (x. 22) is too slight to show that he was acquainted with P's narrative, for these facts would naturally form elements of the Mosaic tradition; and Deuteronomy's description of the making of the Ark, except in the one fact that it was made of acacia-wood (x. 3), differs as widely as possible from that of P; see McNeile, *Deut.* pp. 50 f.

had in view, as that purpose is illustrated by the method he adopted in dealing with JE, the only history book with which he seems to have been acquainted. His purpose is purely didactic; he desires to enforce his own homily by quotations from the only records of the patriarchal and Mosaic epochs which he and his hearers know. Because his aim is homiletic, he adds parenetic comments. He drives home the lessons of gratitude and obedience to be derived from those stirring incidents by the emphasis which he lays on them in his own unique amplificatory additions, graphic summaries, and helpful explanations. He feels, for instance, that it was for *the people's*, not for his own, faults that the faultless Moses had been punished (i. 37).

But what of the interrelation of JE, Deuteronomy, and P, in the more definitely *legislative* sphere? What are the sources of the Deuteronomic legislation in Deut. xii.–xxvi.?

Since Deuteronomy is the last book of the Pentateuch, and is alleged by its author to be a record of Moses' *final* words on all matters of which it treats, words uttered by him in Moab immediately before his death, it ought, if this is really the case, to presuppose, in its legislative enactments, each of the two chief groups of legal enactments detailed on pp. 58 f. above. The writer might not, indeed, find occasion to mention *every* law; but in a manual intended to teach Israel its duties towards God and man, surely *important* laws of the older code would be included.

Now, in the case of Deuteronomy, in the many instances in which there are parallels[1] to its provisions in the earlier books of the Pentateuch, we find, on the one hand, that the provisions of the 'Book of the Covenant' are

[1] A number of laws, especially in chs. xxi.–xxv., have no parallels in any of the other Codes (see the lists in McNeile, *Deut.*, pp. 86 f.); they doubtless have their origin in many cases in earlier customs and injunctions of which no independent notice any longer survives.

constantly and avowedly reaffirmed, expanded, altered or transformed, while, on the other, the author shows *no knowledge* of P as a *legislative system*, as opposed to a few *isolated allusions* to some *individual* laws incorporated in certain parts of P. To only one part of P, namely the 'Law of Holiness,' does Deuteronomy show any definite parallelism. But this part, as we have seen, contains older elements, and Deuteronomy is not built upon it as it is upon the 'Book of the Covenant.' The position with regard to the Priestly *legislation*, as a *system* which it is incumbent upon every Israelite to observe, is exactly the same as with regard to the Priestly *narratives* —the author of Deuteronomy is silent about both. So far as he and his contemporaries for whom he writes are concerned, P as a formulated law-code is non-existent.

That all this is the case is proved at sufficient length by Dr. McNeile on pp. 54–89 of his fascinating study of Deuteronomy's place in Revelation, to which attention had been repeatedly called already in this chapter; hence, only a few typical examples need be given here.

The following is an instance of mere repetition in Deuteronomy of an injunction of the 'Book of the Covenant':—

Ex. xxiii. 19b (and xxxiv. 26b).	Deut. xiv. 21b.
Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk.	Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk.

Sometimes we get slight alterations, as in—

Ex. xxiii. 6, 8.	Deut. xvi. 19.
Thou shalt not wrest the judgment of thy poor in his cause. And a bribe thou shalt not take; for a bribe blindeth them that have sight, and subverteth the words [*i.e.* the cause] of the righteous.	Thou shalt not wrest judgment; thou shalt not respect persons; and thou shalt not take a bribe; for a bribe blindeth the eyes of the wise, and subverteth the words [*i.e.* the cause] of the righteous.

But the laws of worship will serve still better to illustrate to the reader how Deuteronomy presupposes the usage enjoined by the 'Book of the Covenant' and, as the case may be, develops, or modifies, or abrogates, its injunctions.

The first law in Deuteronomy (chs. xii.–xiii.) enjoins the complete abandonment of local sanctuaries, and the substitution for them, by force of law, of one central national sanctuary. It uses the word 'place' in that technical sense of a sanctuary which we have already noticed.[1] It points back to the law of Exodus xx. 24[b], to which we have also already referred: "In every place where I record my name I will come unto thee and I will bless thee." This local sanctuary worship, now corrupted by intermixture with Canaanite idolatry and immoral customs, the author of Deuteronomy seeks to suppress. Whence the inspiration came to him thus to exterminate such abuses by this radical step of legalising only one central sanctuary, and of doing away with even those local sanctuaries which could claim a theophany in the past and therefore the protection of Ex. xx. 24 in the present, we must enquire in a moment.

Or take the three annual Pilgrimages. Our legislator, with his one central sanctuary, has to ensure that they will in future be celebrated at this one central sanctuary; in earlier days they had been made to the local sanctuaries. Certain of the minutiæ of his regulations (xvi. 1-17) also bear evidence of reproducing the customs of an age different from those in which the briefer regulations of JE originated (Ex. xxiii. 14–17; xxxiv. 18, 22 f.).

Similar results follow from an examination of the

[1] See p. 60 above.

regulations as to tithes, firstlings, and other important matters in the institutional and sacrificial spheres.

But—not to weary the reader with further ecclesiastical and sacrificial regulations, which mean so little in our lives, but meant so much for the Hebrews, and which, as set forth in JE and Deuteronomy, cover the development of several centuries—let us take an enactment of a civil and domestic nature. Deut. xv. 12–18 regulates the manumission of Hebrew slaves. Compare with this Ex. xxi. 2–7.

THE 'BOOK OF THE COVENANT.'

2. If thou buy an Hebrew servant, six years he shall serve: and in the seventh he shall go out
3. free for nothing. If he come in by himself, he shall go out by himself: if he be married, then his wife
4. shall go out with him. If his master give him a wife, and she bear him sons and daughters; the wife and her children shall be her master's, and he shall go out by himself.

DEUTERONOMY.

12. If thy brother, an Hebrew or an Hebrew woman, be sold unto thee, and serve thee six years; then in the seventh year thou shalt let him go free from thee.

13. And when thou lettest him go free from thee, thou shalt not let
14. him go empty: thou shalt furnish him liberally out of thy flock, and out of thy threshing-floor, and out of thy winepress: as the LORD thy God hath blessed thee thou shalt
15. give unto him. And

thou shalt remember that thou wast a bondman in the land of Egypt, and the LORD thy God redeemed thee: therefore I command thee this

5. And
if the servant shall plainly say, I love my master, my wife and my children: I will not go out free:

16. thing this day. And it shall be, if he say unto thee, I will not go out from thee; because he loveth thee and thine house, because he is well with thee;

6. then his master shall bring him unto God, and shall bring him to the door, or unto the door post; and his master shall bore his ear through with an awl; and he shall serve him for ever.

17. then thou shalt take an awl, and thrust it through his ear unto the door, and he shall be thy servant for ever. And also unto thy maidservant thou shalt

7. And if a man sell his maidservant, she shall not go out as the menservants do.

18. do likewise. It shall not seem hard unto thee, when thou lettest him go free from thee; for to the double of the hire of an hireling hath he served thee six years: and the LORD thy God shall bless thee in all thou doest.

The similarity of language and general treatment are clear; yet there are also striking differences. The 'Book of the Covenant' confines itself here to Hebrew *male* slaves; Deuteronomy expands this so as expressly to include slaves of both sexes. Deuteronomy omits "bring him unto God," since that custom presupposed the existence of local sanctuaries or domestic images of God, both of which Deuteronomy condemns. The

barbarous practice of retaining a slave's wife on the expiration of his term of slavery, if and because she was his master's slave before she married this slave, is also abrogated. The cruel, cold justice of merely releasing a slave without attempting to provide for his future now gives way to higher and more humanitarian views.

Finally, the very different regulations with regard to slavery in the 'Law of Holiness' in Lev. xxv. 39–46 should be noted. In particular, it is remarkable that while, on the one hand, in Exodus and Deuteronomy the slavery of Israelites is accepted as common, but limits are placed on the absolute power of the master over the slave, and while, moreover, in Deuteronomy philanthropic treatment of him is inculcated, in Leviticus (xxv. 44–6), on the other hand—written, be it noted, according to the chronology of the Pentateuch itself, 40 years *before* the law of Deuteronomy—the legislator seeks to limit slavery to *foreigners*.

Thus the laws of JE constitute the *foundation* of our author's legislation. In fact all injunctions of the 'Book of the Covenant' reappear in Deut. xii.–xxvi., with the exception of (*a*) that of not making steps to the altar (Ex. xx. 26, now less necessary because of the entire suppression of all sanctuaries except the long established one at Jerusalem), (*b*) those of compensations for various injuries (Ex. xxi. 18–xxii. 14, unnecessary in a book designed chiefly for the people's guidance), (*c*) that of the offering of cereals and liquids (Ex. xxii. 29[a]), and (*d*) that of the dedication to Jehovah of first-born sons (Ex. xxii. 29[b]).[1] At times the ancient laws of JE are

[1] "The omission of the command to dedicate the first-born is remarkable; but it would be much more remarkable if the omission was due to Moses himself." McNeile, *Deut.*, p. 56.

repeated *verbatim*, at other times nearly so, either entire or in single clauses. At times, as we have seen, their phraseology is more or less closely followed, even when the provisions are modified in important respects, expanded in principle, or merely furnished with the Deuteronomic hortatory additions and parenetic comments that have already been noticed in the case of the historical retrospects.

A few instances of laws in Deuteronomy and P dealing with the same topics will suffice to show how unmistakably Deuteronomy belongs to a period earlier than that to which the system of P belongs.

Take the important legislation of Deut. xii., which we have already considered in relation to the 'Book of the Covenant.' In Lev. xvii., in the 'Law of Holiness,' a somewhat parallel law is found. But the details show (*a*) that this, though it is an effort to reform the law of Ex. xx. 24, owes its existence to some other legislator than ours, and (*b*) that our legislator certainly has no knowledge of it. But from P's own system, wherein is described at great length the 'Tent of Meeting' with its appurtenances (Ex. xxv.–xxxi., xxxv.–xl., etc), Deuteronomy reveals fundamental differences. It is impossible, then, for Deut. xii. and those laws of P to have emanated from the same writer. Moreover, no room is, in fact, left between JE and our lawgiver for such legislation as this of P's. Finally, P's *presupposition* that only one sanctuary can *ever* have existed demands some such earlier abrogation of Ex. xx. 24 as Deuteronomy and the 'Law of Holiness' provide.[1]

Or take the subject of the Priesthood. Deuteronomy mirrors the usage of a period when the only priests recognised as legitimate were members of the tribe of

[1] See McNeile, *Deut.*, pp. 58–62.

Levi, and conversely the tribe of Levi were *all* priests. The Deuteronomic legislator, having condemned the local sanctuaries, seeks to insure the absorption of those Levitical priests who are thus deprived of their several cures into the service of the one sanctuary which survives, viz., that of Jerusalem, which in pre-Exilic times was in the hands of the Zadokite family of the Levitical priesthood. But the enactments of P are far different. They presuppose the proposals of Ezekiel. It was the latter who, living in the Exile, when all members of the tribe of Levi were still priests, whether they and their forefathers had held cures at Jerusalem or elsewhere, made the proposal (Ez. xliv.) that *in future* only the Zadokite Levites of Jerusalem should retain their status as priests. The rest of the Levites he proposed to degrade for the future from the full exercise of the priesthood owing to their association with the moral and religious abuses practised in the past at the local sanctuaries. It was only after this initial proposal to differentiate between various sections of the Levitical priesthood that P could introduce his three orders, High priest, Aaronic priests, and the non-priestly, but sacred, remainder of the tribe of Levi. Moreover, this fundamental difference between Deuteronomy and P in *nomenclature* and *status*, is accompanied by an almost equally great divergence — which points equally to Deuteronomy's independence of P and to its priority to it—in the regulations for the *maintenance* of the priesthood.[1]

In short D, by which symbol Deuteronomy may conveniently be denoted, presupposes only JE, and

[1] For particulars as to the questions just referred to see the lucid treatment in McNeile, *Deut.*, pp. 67–80. P's regulations with regard to the Levitical cities, the year of Jubilee, the various *kinds* of sacrifice, and indeed his whole elaborate system, should be especially noted and compared with those of Deuteronomy.

undoubtedly the relative order of the documents is JE, D, H, P.

We may now pass on to enquire what is the *specific aim* of Deuteronomy? Our author demands something more than the *mere* observance of his legislation. His specific aim is to enforce these laws with especial insistence on the *motives* that should animate those who observe them. If, in many of these laws, his own *humanitarian* principles betray themselves, as we have seen they do, he would persuade his readers to share these same principles and to embody them in their observance of these laws. If his zeal for the honour, the moral nature, the moral claims, and the sole Godhead, of Jehovah, compel him to propose, as we have noted they do, these sweeping and revolutionary changes in regard even to the outward worship of Jehovah, it is because his whole being is given up to this stupendous task of converting his nation to both the outward and the inward, to the practical as well as to the theoretical, recognition of these attributes of Jehovah. He is urging upon them the duty of translating them into the terms of their own life-purpose, and of realising them in their own avoidance of all selfishness, idolatry, and immorality, in both the narrower and the broader sense of the words. Throughout his book, in its most prosaic legal details as well as in its pragmatic treatment of Mosaic history or in its purest parenetic sections, there echoes and re-echoes one oft-repeated cry, one haunting motive, one unfailing refrain—LOVE OF GOD.[1] It is this which

[1] 'Love' with God as object appears in v. 10, vi. 5, vii. 9, x. 12, xi. 1, 13, 22, xiii. 3, xix. 9, xxx. 6, 16, 20 (*cf.* Josh. xxii. 5, xxiii. 11). Elsewhere in the Pentateuch only in Ex. xx. 6 (= Deut. v. 10). 'Love' on the part of God for His people is emphasised in vii. 8, 13, xxiii. 5; *cf.* iv. 37, x. 15 (the patriarchs), x. 18 (the protected stranger), but not elsewhere in the whole Hexateuch. *Cf.* the still stronger verb employed to express this thought in vii. 7, x. 15.

must nerve them to this supreme revolution in their religious and social customs. It is this which must drive them, if need be, to the extermination of brother, son, daughter, or even wife (Deut. xiii. 6), if from such dear ones comes the temptation to indulge in Canaan's false Baal-worship and demoralising nature-cults; for to 'love' these latter is the antithesis of that pure worship and love which Jehovah demands of them in return for His love of them. It is this which is to embolden them to rectify the scales of justice, to readjust the social system, to right the wrongs of the down-trodden poor—"the widow, the orphan, and the stranger"—even if to do so costs them their own, often ill-gotten, wealth. Thus Love of God should issue not only in the purity of the worship of Him and the recognition of His Divine attributes, but also in a Justice, Equity, and Integrity such as are dictated only by Philanthropy, Generosity, and Kindness.[1]

The writer's enthusiasm and warmth of emotion find expression in the flowing and impressive oratory of which he shows himself such a consummate master. His style is absolutely new in Hebrew literature; it carries the reader with it, and holds him enthralled. It speedily attracted many imitators and helped to found a school as much devoted to that style and to his homiletic genius as to his high principles and characteristic stand-point. It is a style absolutely unlike that of P. The 'Law of Holiness,' it is true, rises to a sublime height in its demand for *moral* as well as *ceremonial holiness*, and like Deuteronomy insists strongly on the *brotherhood*[2] of Israelites. But H's phrases, "I am Jehovah your (their) God," "I

[1] See McNeile, *Deut.*, pp. 20–30.

[2] 'Brother' occurs in this connection in H in Lev. xix. 17, xxv. 25, 35, 36, 39, 47, but it so occurs in the laws neither of JE nor of P.

am Jehovah," never occur in Deuteronomy. The Deuteronomic phrases, "Jehovah thy God" (231 times), "Jehovah our God" (23 times), "Jehovah your God" (46 times), never occur in this way in H.[1] Moreover, while H shows closest affinity with Ezekiel,[2] Deuteronomy approximates *very* closely to Jeremiah [3] and differs from H in numerous other ways.

Consequently, though the style of Deuteronomy is, as regards *vocabulary*, marked by comparatively few exceptional words, it possesses a distinctive colouring, derived chiefly from the remarkably frequent *recurrence* of particular words and phrases and often of whole clauses. A list of 70 such words and phrases Dr. Driver gives in his *Deuteronomy*, pp. lxxviii–lxxxiv. The reader should at least consult the brief alphabetical English list in McNeile, *op. cit.*, pp. 99–104, of which two pages (pp. 101–2) are reproduced here :—

"*Eye. Thine eye shall not pity.*[4] vii. 16; xiii. 8; xix. 13, 21; xxv. 12.*[5]

Which thine eyes have seen (or *shall see*). iv. 9; vii. 19; x. 21; xxviii. 34, 67; xxix. 3.*

Fear Jehovah, to (with the substantival infinitive *l*^{e}*yir'ah* (9 times).*

Fruit of thy (*the*) *ground* (10 times). Elsewhere only Gen. iv. 3*; Jer. vii. 20; Ps. cv. 35.

Fruit of thy womb (*body*). vii. 13; xxviii. 4, 11, 18, 53; xxx. 9; Gen. xxx. 2.* *Cf.* Lam. ii. 20; Ps. xxi. 10.

[1] In fact, none of these three Deuteronomic expressions is found elsewhere in the Pentateuch except in Ex. xv. 26, xx. 5, 7, 10, 12, xxiii. 19 = xxxiv. 26, xxxiv. 24 (all JE).

[2] See pp. 62 f. above.

[3] On Deuteronomy and Jeremiah see McNeile, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 115–119, or the still fuller treatment in Driver, *Deuteronomy*, pp. xcii–xciv.

[4] The same Hebrew expression has a different meaning in Gen. xlv. 20, "regard not."

[5] An asterisk denotes that all the passages in the Pentateuch in which the expression is found are cited.

Fruit of thy cattle. xxviii. 4, 11, 51; xxx. 9.* Not elsewhere in the Old Testament.

Gates,[1] *thy (your)*—

Within thy gates (19 times). Elsewhere Ex. xx. 10.*

All thy gates. xii. 15; xvi. 18; xxviii. 52, 55.*

One of thy gates. xv. 7; xvi. 5; xvii. 2; xviii. 6; xxiii. 16.*

The gate as the place for administration of justice, xvii. 5, 8; xxi. 19; xxii. 15, 24; xxv. 7.*

Heart. With all your heart and with all your soul (9 times). Jos. xxii. 5; xxiii. 14.

Holy people, a. vii. 6; xiv. 2, 21; xxvi. 19; xxviii. 9.

The exact expression is not found elsewhere in the Old Testament. *Cf.* 'The holy people' (Is. lxii. 12); 'a holy nation' (Ex. xix. 6).

House of bondmen. v. 6; vi. 12; vii. 8; viii. 14; xiii. 5, 10. Elsewhere Ex. xiii. 3, 14; xx. 2; Jos. xxiv. 17 (E).*

Inherit, to cause to (Hebrew *hinḥīl*). i. 38; iii. 28; xii. 10; xix. 3; xxi. 16; xxxi. 7 (xxxii. 8); Jos. i. 6.*

Innocent blood. xix. 10, 13; xxi. 8 f.; xxvii. 25 (R.V. 'an innocent person').* Occurs in no writing earlier than Deuteronomy.

Knowest not, which thou (ye, they; sometimes *thy fathers)* (10 times). *Cf.* xxxii. 17.*

Land, the (this, that) good (9 times). Jos. xxiii. 13, 15. *Cf.* 'A good land' (i. 25; Ex. iii. 8); 'The land is good' (Num. xiv. 7 P).*

The land (possession, cities, gates, etc.) *which Jehovah thy (our,* etc.) *God giveth (hath given) thee (us)* (33 times). Elsewhere Ex. xx. 12; Jos. i. 2, 11, 15; xviii. 3; xxiii. 13, 15 f.*

Law, this [2] (15 times). Of a single regulation, Num. v. 30.*

This (the) book of the law.[2] xxix. 21; xxx. 10; xxxi. 26; Jos. i. 8; viii. 34.*

The words of this law [1] (9 times).*

Live, that thou mayest (ye may). iv. 1; v. 33; viii. 1; xvi. 20; xxx. 6, 16, 19.*

[1] *I.e.* 'cities,' a peculiar usage found in the Deuteronomic passage, 1 Kings viii. 37 (= 2 Chron. vi. 28), perhaps Jer. xiv. 2, and probably not elsewhere.

[2] *I.e.* the law embodied in Deuteronomy

Love (of Jehovah for Israel). iv. 37; vii. 8, 13; x. 15, 18; xxiii. 5.*

(Of Israel for Jehovah) (12 times). Jos. xxii. 5; xxiii. 11. Elsewhere Ex. xx. 6.*

In seven of these twelve, and in the two passages in Joshua, 'to love Jehovah' has the substantival infinitive *l^e'ahăvāh*, the expression being found nowhere else in the Old Testament."[1]

But more important even than the style of Deuteronomy is the question as to whence the author obtained these high ideals, this consuming love for God, which he tried to communicate to his fellow countrymen by exhortation and by legal enactment.

Our answer to this particular question should suffice once for all to allay those timorous apprehensions which are heard now and again, and which are illustrated by Mr. McClure's remarks about the 'literary critic':—

"He may, for instance, have accepted the view that evolution covers the whole domain of human thought and of its expression; that the religious ideas of mankind have consequently a subjective origin, and a subjective origin only; that the conception of a personal God, and of the possibility of communion with Him, is a conception only, and does not imply in itself any objective reality." [2]

No doubt 'he may' have done this. But Mr. McClure must surely know that critical conclusions such as those here in question are perfectly compatible with a full belief in the inspiration of the prophets and other teachers of Israel, and, what is more, that there are numberless critics who beyond question have this full belief. It is notorious that writer after writer, and teacher after teacher, in the Universities and Theological Colleges, who have accepted critical principles and critical conclusions, are neither be-

[1] See more fully p. 112 above.

[2] Preface, pp. iv, v, to the *S.P.C.K.* translation of Troelstra already referred to in Ch. II.

lievers in a naturalistic theory of the universe nor deniers of the existence of a personal God, but are whole-hearted believers in the inspiration of the prophets and writers of the Old Testament.[1] Evolution, as a theory embracing more or less of the physical universe, may be, and no doubt has been, taught by agnostic and naturalistic writers; but that is no hindrance to its being accepted and taught by Christian thinkers[2]—in so far as it has been scientifically proved—as the principle by which it has pleased God to operate in the physical world. In the same way there is no reason whatever why the conclusions of literary criticism—in so far as they are sound—whosoever their first discoverers or other teachers may have been, should not be accepted and taught by Christian teachers: indeed, it is the *duty* of Christian teachers to accept them as part of the truth of God. It is now known that God brought the physical world to its present state in a manner very different from that in which, prior to investigation, He was supposed to have brought it; similarly, it is believed by

[1] *E.g.*, F. W. Farrar, *op. cit.*, etc.; A. B. Davidson, art. PROPHECY AND PROPHETS in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. iv.; W. Robertson Smith, *The Prophets of Israel*, 1882; C. A. Briggs, *Messianic Prophecy*, 1886; A. F. Kirkpatrick, *The Divine Library of the Old Testament*, 1891, etc.; S. R. Driver, *Sermons on Subjects connected with the Old Testament*, 1892 (esp. V. *The Hebrew Prophets*; VI. *The Voice of God in the Old Testament*; VII. *Inspiration*); W. Sanday, *Inspiration* (Bampton Lectures, 1893), espec. pp. 117–122; George Adam Smith, *The Book of the Twelve Prophets*, 1896, *Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament*, 1901, etc.; J. E. McFadyen, *Old Testament Criticism and the Christian Church*, 1903; H. E. Ryle, *On Holy Scripture and Criticism*, 1904; J. Armitage Robinson, *Some Thoughts on Inspiration*, 1905; E. A. Edghill, *An Enquiry into the Evidential Value of Prophecy*, 1906; G. A. Cooke, *The Progress of Revelation, Sermons chiefly on the Old Testament*, 1910; A. S. Peake, *Jeremiah*, 1911, etc.

[2] See Aubrey Moore, *Science and the Faith*, 1889; Driver, *Sermons* (referred to above in *n.* 1), Sermon I., *Evolution compatible with Faith*. Of course Evolution—so far as its principles are scientifically established—is generally accepted by Christian thinkers.

those who have studied the subject most thoroughly that many parts of the Bible reached their present form in a manner very different from that in which, prior to investigation, they were supposed to have reached it. And the one truth must be accepted as humbly and dutifully as the other. There are many subjects, including in particular those having relations with both science and theology, on which opinions once regarded as axiomatic have been shown by the progress of knowledge to be untenable, and have in consequence been universally abandoned: but scientific, not theological, arguments have won the day; and if critical conclusions are to be opposed, the only legitimate way of opposing them is by the use of critical methods, in which full account is taken of all the relevant facts, and not by vague and unjust insinuations of their anti-Christian character, made by men who, as soon as they begin to enter into details, at once betray their ignorance both of the conclusions which critics really hold, and of the grounds upon which these conclusions really rest.

Christian critics, then, do not for a moment doubt the inspiration either of the prophets or of the author of Deuteronomy. The Deuteronomist drew his ideals partly from his own inspiration, partly from the inspired teaching of earlier prophets. It has indeed been critics who have been among the foremost to recognise the unique position which these prophets occupy.

"In Hebrew prophecy there is a mysterious movement of the human spirit towards the divine Being as the prophets, in being made instruments to others, heard God speaking directly to their own souls. It is a lasting witness of the divine will revealing itself to certain favoured individuals for communication to others. It is, further, a witness to the yearning of the human spirit to hold communion with the deity, to learn His will, to see into His mind. Different in

intensity, it had points of contact with phenomena which existed and still exist among other peoples, especially among Semitic peoples. Diviners existed, for instance, among the Philistines, and the consulting of all kinds of soothsayers, augurs, prognosticators, wizards, and possessors of familiar spirits was condemned in the severest language in Deut. xviii. 10, 11, a passage which shows that, while these resembled genuine prophets of Jehovah, they were not in reality inspired by Jehovah." [1] Hence "The God of the Old Testament is essentially the God of revelation. A characteristic feature of the religion of Israel is its gradual but steady growth in width and elevation." . . . "The *names* by which the prophets call themselves show their recognition of intercourse between themselves and the deity. . . . Still more striking proof of the conviction held by the prophets that at certain moments in their lives they have held communion with God, have actually spoken with Him, and have been admitted into the council of Jehovah (Jer. xxiii. 22) is supplied by records of their calls. . . . The deity becomes abnormally immanent in those whose theocratic functions demand close relationship between themselves and Jehovah; the spirit of Jehovah 'comes upon,' 'comes mightily on,' 'falls on,' 'descends and rests on,' 'fills,' and even 'puts on' such persons. . . . Only a consciousness of close intimacy with Jehovah could have given to the prophets the consciousness of their ability to work miracles such as Elijah's on Mount Carmel. Only an absolute certainty of the genuineness of their own relations with Jehovah could have led the prophets to denounce the so-called 'false prophets.' Their daring to predict future events—predictions which only rarely failed to come true (Deut. xviii. 22)—indicates reality in the mental experience of 'the hand of Jehovah.' That the prophets came into particularly close communion with God is presupposed by their constant resort to *prayer*; for to pray is to demonstrate

[1] *Communion with God*, 1911, pp. 119 f., by Dr. Darwell Stone, Principal of Pusey House, and the present writer. This short volume deals with the reality of prophetic experience as an illustration of the closeness of union between particular men and God, not only as a possibility but also as an actual fact realised in the Hebrew prophets; while the prophets' message, *because inspired by God*, is one among other illustrations of communion with God mediated to ordinary men.

consciousness of direct relation with, and immediate access to, a great spiritual power. Jeremiah, for instance, prayed about his personal needs and difficulties (Jer. xx.), through prayer obtained divine responses as to the people's fate (xxxiii. 3; xlii. 4), and through prayer made his persistent and repeated intercession for his people (xiv.; *cf.* Amos vii. 5)." [1]

Thus one and the same writer undoubtedly can and does accept and teach the critical position, while he believes firmly in the very highest and most immediate inspiration to be found in the Old Testament—that of the prophets. Moreover, if the reader will refer to longer and fuller works written by critics, such as those mentioned on p. 117, *n.* 1, he will find expressed in all of them the same conviction of the reality of the prophets' inspiration.

How exactly the teaching of these particular prophets Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah, was applied to the specific problems of their day, and how, most probably in Manasseh's darkest days, their immediate followers were by this teaching inspired to produce the Deuteronomic legislation, and how it was promulgated with prophetic sanction, in the 18th year of Josiah, is a story to which reference will be made in Ch. VII. Nor is there any need here to deal further with the belief, accepted without inquiry by so many generations, that Moses himself wrote the Pentateuch. Of all this a full discussion can be read in Dr. McNeile's book, where such statements as that Deuteronomy 'abounds with archaisms,' and with other marks of Mosaic date, are shown, to be contrary to the facts; and the attempts made to point out alleged inconsistencies on the part of the critics, and to prove that their arguments amount to nothing, are shown to be abortive.

[1] *Communion with God*, pp. 70, 120–124.

Reference has been made above (p. 113) to the Deuteronomic 'school.' Its activities seem to have been considerable. It was this school which prefixed and appended to the central portion and kernel of Deuteronomy whatever at the beginning and end of the book seems to date from a somewhat later period. Probably some of those passages in the first four books of the Pentateuch, such, for instance, as the explanatory additions to the Decalogue, which, though appearing in JE sections, yet approximate more closely to the Deuteronomic style and point of view than to the style and point of view of the rest of JE, are due to the labours of this school. Probably, however, others of these sections mark the gradual rise of this parenetic style in the environment in which the author of Deuteronomy lived, a style which he, however, undoubtedly perfected and made peculiarly his own. But the great work of the Deuteronomic School was to turn to homiletic use, and so incidentally to preserve for the Christian Church, a variety of traditions and documents relating to the nation's history during and after the process of the settlement in Canaan and onwards up to their own times. Thus in Judges ii. 6–xvi. we have extracts preserved from an ancient pre-Exilic book of heroes, provided with a general homiletic prologue (ii. 6–iii. 6), and with a special prologue and usually also an epilogue to each story of the more important individual 'Judges.'

The valuable documents of 1 and 2 Kings, to take but one more instance, are similarly preserved for the study of Christians of to-day in consequence, humanly speaking, of the careful treatment they received at the hands of some member of the Deuteronomic School. It was, on the one hand, because of this definitely homiletic treatment that—in spite of the rival claims

of 1 and 2 Chronicles to treat the same period from the more pronouncedly ecclesiastical point of view—this work was endeared to the later Jewish Church; and because of this same treatment the Books of Kings are still of primary value to Christians of to-day. It is, on the other hand, because of the Deuteronomic editors' preservation of these old traditions, within a carefully formulated framework, that these books, like the ancient material in other historical books of the Old Testament, furnish first-class evidence as to the actual religious and institutional life of the Hebrews. Thus, by their aid, Christian students can still discriminate between the various Pentateuchal documents, and settle their relative ages—a line of reasoning quite independent of the internal evidence supplied by the Pentateuch itself, but one which, as the next chapter will show, points unmistakably to the same general conclusions.

CHAPTER VI

THE PENTATEUCH IN THE LIGHT OF HEBREW HISTORY

THE previous chapters will have made it clear how distinctly the various documents incorporated in the Pentateuch themselves reveal their separate authorship. It has been seen that they fall naturally into four main groups. These groups, each belonging to a distinct epoch of the nation's history and development, and each reflecting a more or less decided advance upon the group immediately preceding it, are for the sake of convenience usually referred to under the symbols JE, D, H, and P.

Within each of these documents there still remai traces of a gradual growth. We observe in them the juxtaposition of very ancient elements and of quite recent accretions dating from times only just prior to those in which the tradition crystallised into written form. Thus, in JE,[1] the 'Book of the Covenant' is partly the outcome, we may suppose, of a slow growth of religious customs,[2] and partly a collection of civil decisions,[3] originally covering individual cases in dispute, but ultimately serving as established precedents.[4]

[1] For the resolution of JE into its earlier and later elements see Ch. IV. above. This question, however, does not vitally concern us at this point.

[2] Ex. xx. 23–25; xxii. 20–24, 28–31; xxiii. 10–19, *etc.*

[3] Ex. xxi.; xxii. 1–19, *etc.*

[4] This appears from the fact that they are technically described

A number of its civil injunctions, moreover, seem to have been taken over by Israel, probably from the Canaanites amongst whom they dwelt. The long domination of Babylon over Canaan makes it not improbable that the laws and customs of the Canaanites were to some extent coloured by those of Babylonia. There are undoubtedly in the 'Book of the Covenant' a number of resemblances to the 'Code of Ḥammurabi,' and some also in Deuteronomy and the 'Law of Holiness'; and it is possible that the laws exhibiting these resemblances may have been adopted by the Hebrews from the Canaanites.[1]

Similarly the laws of Deuteronomy (Deut. xii.–xxvi.) consist to some considerable extent, as was explained in Ch. V., of a repetition of those of JE and of some other ancient laws. The Deuteronomist has adapted such laws to a different and subsequent period of the nation's history, and has remodelled some of them in order to make them the vehicle of a new religious, moral, and social reformation. Hence, before the Deuteronomist proceeded to utilise them for his own specific purpose, *individual* laws among them must necessarily have existed in a somewhat less developed and less homogeneous form. Even in the case of laws which incorporate the Deuteronomist's most revolutionary proposals, and which may therefore for all practical purposes be looked upon as almost entirely his creation, it is possible from them to infer what in general outline must have been the

as 'judgments' (Ex. xxi. 1; xxiv. 3). See especially Ex. xviii. 16, where the decisions in *civil* disputes are called the 'statutes and directions of God.'; *cf.* art. Law (in Old Testament), in *H. D. B.*, vol. iii., p. 66 f.; *Enc. Biblica*, col. 2734; Driver, *Exodus*, pp. 161 f., 169 f., 209.

[1] See Driver, *Exodus*, pp. 418 ff.; C. H. W. Johns, art. Code of Ḥammurabi in *H. D. B.*, extra vol. There are no parallels in P to the 'Code of Hammurabi'; (on Num. v. 16-28 see Driver, *Exodus*, p. 423, *n.*).

custom or usage to the modification of which they were directed. Practically all the laws in Deuteronomy have, in short, as we have just seen is the case with those of JE, a double aspect, viz. (*a*) at times they incidentally tell us something of the state of things existing *just before* the compiler's own day, and (*b*) they offer us still more important evidence as to what must have become customary *after*, and *as a result of*, their promulgation during Josiah's reign in their present elaborated form in the code in which they now survive. Thus from some of the laws in Deuteronomy, after removing the special features due to their general seventh-century background or to the prophetic activities of that century or to the Deuteronomic legislator's special purpose in drawing up his code, one might with a fair degree of certainty arrive at some sort of general idea regarding the customs and institutions existing in the period preceding the seventh century. For example, the inculcation of the centralised worship was the Deuteronomic compiler's own work, and therefore also the proposal to admit the members of the rural Levitical guilds to the privileges of that Levitical guild which had hitherto enjoyed undisputed possession of the Jerusalem Temple and its revenues. From these two new proposals alone, even if we could not consult the old historical sources in Judges, Samuel, and Kings, we might infer that, before the Deuteronomist's days, sacrifice had been legitimately—and extensively—offered at local sanctuaries as well as at the Temple at Jerusalem, and that the priesthood had come to be confined throughout the land to the professional 'Levitical' guilds of priests. In short, supposing no earlier code of laws had come down to us, it might still be possible to reconstruct some of the main outlines of such a code from the laws in

Deuteronomy, if we first eliminated from the latter those elements which, we know, belong to the age of Manasseh or owe their inclusion in Deuteronomy to their having become the depositories of the teaching of the eighth-century prophets.

The same is true of that separate collection of laws (Lev. xvii.–xxvi.) which is embedded in P and which is so organically related to Ezekiel. As a *distinct code*, produced to insist on *Holiness* as the motive and mainspring of the religious life, and so in its several parts presenting a number of laws adjusted to express this motive in the outward acts of life, it belongs definitely to the circles in which Ezekiel received his early religious training and peculiar bent of mind. But *individual* regulations, contained in this 'Law of Holiness' and remodelled by its editor to express his own peculiar aim, undoubtedly go back in their origins, as is shown by Ezekiel's references to them as to an authoritative basis of morals, religion, and life, to a considerably earlier period.[1]

Nor did the writer who drew up the Priestly narratives and legislation act otherwise than had the authors of JE, D, and H before him. He was no more than they a reckless and fanatical innovator. His purpose, on the contrary, was not the destruction or abolition of the religion of his forefathers, or the revolutionising of it in a catastrophic manner, but its serious reformation, its thorough purification, and its careful, logical expression till it should not merely embrace the fullest ceremonial development and the most real moral advance of which his age was conscious, but should also crystallise within itself the fuller realisation of those truths concerning God, Israel, and the world, which had now been

[1] See pp. 61-3 above.

vouchsafed to his own generation and to himself. He did not, therefore, *create* the laws which survive in his collection. To some extent he adapted and amplified, in the lawyer-like style probably now beginning to be customary in priestly circles, injunctions already in existence, which he selected as being best suited for inclusion in his law-book, and for the expression of the truths which he wished to enunciate. Of this practice his inclusion of the ' Law of Holiness ' in his own writings is an excellent example. Nor can it be doubted that many of the ritual laws at the beginning of Leviticus, and also of those in other parts of Leviticus and in Numbers, were incorporated by him *en bloc* from some early Exilic collection of ritual directions (Heb. *Tōrōth*), which were drawn up originally for priests and worshippers in the pre-Exilic Temple. And many other laws in P, some demonstrably, and others, as may be safely inferred from the archaic character of details embodied in them, also go back *in their germs* to a quite ancient period of the nation's history, perhaps in some cases even to its very beginning. Consequently, to say that ' P is Exilic ' and was promulgated by Ezra after the commencement of the post-Exilic period, is *not* to say that Ezra *manufactured* it *ex nihilo* the night before he set out from Babylon, or that there are no pre-Exilic elements to be found in it.

Let the reader therefore notice carefully the *particular sense* in which the statement that ' P is Exilic ' is true —for its true meaning has often been greatly misunderstood. There is a sense in which it is quite false, and one which would be repudiated by the critics as much as by the upholders of the traditional standpoint; there is another sense in which it is, as critics believe, perfectly true. It is *false*, if the laws of ' P ' are supposed to be the *inventions* of the Exilic age, in which case—as conser-

vatives rightly point out, though wrongly urging their objection against persons who do not hold the opinion which it is their aim to refute—it would be incredible that the Jewish nation would have accepted them ;[1] it is *true*, if 'P' is the final codification and formulation of laws which in their actual origin are of great age and, in their original form, go back to the beginnings of religious institutions and observances in Israel.

P has, therefore, like JE and D, this double aspect. Though the ancient and trustworthy sources for the history of the Hebrews show, like JE and D, no acquaintance with laws regulating important ceremonial institutions *in the shape in which they are expounded in P, and with the precise formalities found in that document*, yet, on the other hand these same historical sources prove the critics' contention that some at least of those institutions were *of ancient origin* and were in existence before P attached them to his own systematic circle of ideas. "They attest the existence of certain institutions ; they do not attest the existence of the particular document (P) in which the regulations touching those institutions are now codified." The thoughtful student of the Old Testament, it must always be remembered, has *two* sets of facts to account for : he has to account both for the *late* date of P as evidenced by a multitude of convergent data, and for the *early* mention of various institutions and religious observances which he finds codified in P. The traditional position—even supposing that it were on other grounds tenable—accounts only for the *second* set of these facts. *Both* sets of facts can

[1] It is for instance in this *false* sense that Mr. McClure (in his Preface to the *S.P.C.K.* translation of Troelstra already referred to) ascribes to the critics the belief that "all Leviticus and large portions of Exodus and Numbers, among others, belong to the date of the Exile."

be accounted for only on the critical view, as here enunciated.

Consequently, if JE, D, and H were all no longer extant, we might still infer something from P as to what institutions, customs, and more or less technical terms were in existence in pre-Exilic days. We should urge that the *custom of sacrifice*, about which P has such minute regulations, must have existed, though with less developed and specialised ceremonial, in the pre-Exilic period; a glance at the old historical traditions outside the Pentateuch, as at JE and D within it, shows how fully justified such an inference would be.

Thus, when we turn to 1 Sam. vi. 14 and x. 8, we find allusions to burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, while 1 Sam. ii. 28 shows that the technical term 'fire-sacrifice' was a well-known pre-Exilic expression; and 1 Sam. vi. 3 ff.—to say nothing of 2 Kings xii. 16, Ezek. xl. 39, xlii. 13, xliv. 29, xlvi. 20—is amply sufficient to show that the compiler of P did not create the term 'guilt-offering.' Indeed, though the ceremonial and other details will no doubt have differed, the fundamental idea of the *'āshām*, as involving a reparation for an injury done or for a rightful due withheld, is the same both in the *'āshām* offered by the Philistines to Jehovah and in the *'āshām* as prescribed in P.[1] On the other hand, to contend for the *very early* use of *minḥāh* in the sense of 'cereal (non-blood, meal) offering' would be fraught with difficulties owing to its use in *early* pre-Exilic literature to denote both blood and non-blood offerings.[2]

We should be right in urging that a priesthood of some sort or other existed (though not with the clear-cut dis-

[1] See the commentaries on Lev. v. 14-vi 7, and on Isa liii. 10 (where the R.V. marg. '*guilt-offering*' should be noted).

[2] See p. 61 above.

tinctions drawn in P between its various orders), since the word 'priest' is so constantly and continually used in early as well as in late books of the Old Testament.[1] Among other terms and customs may be mentioned 'Urim and Thummim' (1 Sam. xxviii. 6);[2] 'ephod' (1 Sam. xiv. 3; xxiii. 6, 9; xx. 7); 'savour of satisfaction' (Gen. viii. 21, J); 'unclean,' applied to food (Judg. xiii. 4, 7); Nazirite vows (Judg. xiii. 5, 7; xvi. 17; Amos ii. 11 f.); tithes and free-will offerings (Amos iv. 4, 5); shew-bread (1 Sam. xxi. 6); 'lamp of God' (1 Sam. iii. 3).

In view of these facts it is surprising that Mr. McClure, unless indeed he is ignorant both of the critics' writings and of the Sacred Text itself, should ask, as if the question were one to which critics could give no answer, "From

[1] The expression 'idolatrous priests,' which in the Revised Version occurs in 2 Kings xxiii. 5, represents the Hebrew word transliterated *Chemarim* in that version in Zeph. i. 4, and occurring elsewhere in the Old Testament only in Hos. x. 5, where the Revisers translate it 'priests.' Except in this last passage, the word 'priest' throughout the Revised Version of the Old Testament always represents the Hebrew word *Kōhēn*, or the corresponding Aramaic equivalent. In fact, in the Old Testament as a whole, it is used about 750 times. The same word is met with in Phœnician inscriptions to denote a 'priest' and its feminine to denote a 'priestess.' Hence Mr. McClure's emphasis (p. vii of his Preface to the *S.P.C.K.* translation of Troelstra's book) on the use of this general term (*Kōhēn*) for 'priest' in Leviticus and in the Aramaic papyri cannot in any case prove anything as to the date of P.

[2] Note, too, 1 Sam. xiv. 41, where the Massoretic text, with the strange expression rendered in R.V., 'Shew the right' (R.V. marg. = A.V. '*Give a perfect lot*') cannot be right. From the Septuagint, however, the text may be restored: 'Why dost thou not answer thy servant to-day? If this fault be in me, or in Jonathan my son, O Jehovah God of Israel, give Urim; and if it be in thy people Israel, give Thummim.' Here the words rendered *give Thummim* are in Hebrew the same consonants, rightly vocalised, which, as vocalised in the Massoretic Text, produce the singular expression referred to above. The other words have dropped out by homœoteleuton.

what ancient documents—other than those which they have relegated to a late date—do the critics learn anything of this pre-Exilic ritual? They must go back to an earlier time than that assigned to Deuteronomy. Where is the authority to be found that will enable the critics to say that the Priests' Code embodies ancient ritual?" Critics do *not*, as he states, "relegate to a late date" the passages referred to. These belong, one and all, to what they regard as the *early* historical literature. His question needs no further answer than the facts which have been stated just above[1]—facts stated, as has already been indicated, as long ago as 1891, by Dr. Driver in the first edition of his *Introduction*, and appearing in identically the same words in the current (ninth) edition.

It may, however, be helpful to add the words of an 'advanced' critic, the late Professor Stade, of Giessen, in his *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 1888, vol. ii. p. 66, note: "We find in Lev. i.–vii., xi.–xv., xvii.–xxvi., Num. v., vi., ix., xv., xix., laws which for the most part must be recognised as the *formulation in writing of pre-Exilic usage*."[2]

We have so far dealt only with this one aspect of JE, D, H and P. Before we proceed to their other aspect, it may be well to note in passing that the Aramaic papyri recently discovered at Elephantine, throwing as they do

[1] For further instances see Driver, *Introduction*, pp. 143 ff. (ed. 1, pp. 126 ff.), where, if Mr. McClure had but referred to it, he would have found the answer which he supposed no one was capable of giving.

[2] On the still earlier recognition by Kuenen, Wellhausen, and other Continental scholars of the amount of pre-Exilic usage, and for proof of the complete and early consensus of opinion among critics of even an earlier generation than the present, see the conclusive quotations from their published works given by Dr. Burney, in the *Expositor*, 1912, pp. 101–8.

a most interesting light on Jewish life and religion in Egypt in 408 B.C.,[1] in no way contradict the critical position with regard to the Pentateuch. Three of those papyri were published by Dr. Sachau in 1907,[2] and republished in 1911 along with numerous other papyri and ostraka.[3] The first of these papyri (of which the second is a doublet), is a copy of a letter addressed to Bagohi, the governor of Judah, by the Jewish residents at Yeb, the native Egyptian name of Elephantine. Their forefathers had originally been brought there, presumably as military colonists, very much earlier; for, before B.C. 525, the year in which Cambyses subdued Egypt, a temple of Yahu (=Jahveh=Jehovah) had, the letter states, been built on this island.

When, however, these Jewish colonists were first settled in Egypt is not definitely known, and remains a matter

[1] These papyri are important as showing not only that the Egyptian Jews took a lively interest in maintaining their national religious observances, but also that they were open to receive impressions from outside their own body, and even from non-Jewish sources. This is illustrated, for example, by the large admixture in their daily life of Persian elements, due to their association with Persian soldiers and officials; by their tendency to absorb certain pre-Zoroastrian Magian beliefs; and by their devotion to a considerable amount of parenetic and moralising literature of a non-Biblical, and indeed probably of a definitely pagan, origin, pagan literature which, moreover, at any rate in the form in which they read it, belonged to a great extent to a date but little earlier than the Exile. These aspects of their life and some of its characteristic differences, especially in Elephantine, from Palestinian Judaism, the present writer has described in his Introduction to TOBIT in the *Oxford Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, 1913, vol. i. pp. 185–94.

[2] *Drei Aramäische Papyrusurkunden aus Elephantine.*

[3] *Aramäische Papyrus und Ostraka aus einer jüdischen Militär-Kolonie zu Elephantine.* Those acquainted with German will find the most important of these papyri translated in Staerk, *Alte und Neue Aramäische Papyri* (in Lietzmann, *Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen*, No. 94), 1912.

for conjecture. On the strength of a statement by Pseudo-Aristeas,[1] the colony has been supposed by Professor Sayce to date from the age of Psammetichus I. (663–609 B.C.). But that it is Psammetichus I. is by no means certain. Apart from the passage in Pseudo-Aristeas, if indeed even he means really to refer to Psammetichus I. and not to Psammetichus II. (593–588), there is no evidence that Psammetichus I. made any expedition against Ethiopia, or that, granting such an expedition for argument's sake, he employed Jewish mercenaries in it. Of course, he *might* have undertaken such a campaign and he *might* have employed Jews, but the fact remains that we have no evidence of this. On the other hand Psammetichus II. did make an expedition against the Ethiopians,[2] to which Pseudo-

[1] "And even before this time [*i.e.*, the reign of Ptolemy son of Lagos] large numbers of Jews had come into Egypt with the Persian, and in an earlier period still others had been sent *to Egypt* to help Psammetichus in his campaign against the king of the Ethiopians." *Letter of Pseudo-Aristeas*, § 13. On this letter see Swete, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, 1900, pp. 10–23 (the Greek text is printed on pp. 519–74). The letter was certainly not written earlier than 200 B.C., the date assigned to it by Dr. Swete (*op. cit.*, p. 16). A new translation, with introduction and notes, by the Rev. H. T. Andrews appears in the *Oxford Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, 1913, vol. ii., pp. 83–122.

[2] Herodotus, ii. 161, confirmed by an inscription recently discovered at Karnak: see Ed. Meyer, *Der Papyrusfund aus Elephantine*, 1912, p. 9, *n.* 1; Breasted, *History of the Ancient Egyptians*, 1908, pp. 442 f.

Professor Sayce in this connection (*The Expositor*, Aug. 1911, p. 112, Nov., pp. 420 f.) makes many unfounded assertions. In particular there is *no* evidence that Psammetichus I. settled Jews in Elephantine and Assuan; Herodotus (ii. 30) says that Psammetichus I. established a garrison in Egypt against the Ethiopians and also that he took Ionian and Carian mercenaries into his service (ii. 152); but he makes no mention of any Jews. The inscriptions at Abu-Simbel, written by Greek, Carian, and Phœnician mercenaries, who state that they accompanied Psammetichus to Elephantine—presumably on an expedition against Ethiopia — are referred by all recent Egyptologists *not*, as

Aristeas' statement might well be taken to apply. Certainly Jeremiah attests the presence of Jews in Pathros, *i.e.* in Upper Egypt, as well as in Lower Egypt, shortly after the fall of Jerusalem in 586,[1] but how much earlier they were settled there we do not know. The date of the settlement of the Jews at Elephantine being thus so uncertain, it is obvious that no conclusions of any value can be based upon it.[2] Yet Professor Sayce, having, with little discrimination between fact and surmise, decided in favour of Psammetichus I.—who is at best the less probable of the two alternatives—seeks to destroy the critical hypothesis by arguments unsound, as we shall see, in themselves, and based at the very outset on this more than insecure foundation.

We may now return to the papyri and the information which they give with regard to the Temple at Yeb, the ritual practised there, and the religious institutions in force. The temple itself was "a solid and costly edifice, with stone pillars, five great gates of stone with wooden doors, and a roof of cedar beams."[3] Though spared

Professor Sayce says, to Psammetichus I., but to Psammetichus II., who, as we have just seen, did make an expedition into Ethiopia. See Wiedemann, *Aegyptische Geschichte*, 1884, pp. 631 f.; Maspero (who gives reasons), *The Passing of the Empires*, 1900, pp. 537 *n.* 4, 538; Petrie, *A History of Egypt*, 1905, vol. iii., p. 341; Breasted, *A History of Egypt*, 1906, p. 585; Breasted, *A History of the Ancient Egyptians*, 1908, p. 407; H. R. Hall, *The Ancient History of the Near East*, 1913, pp. 544 f. *Cf.* Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes*, 4th ed., vol. iii., 1909, p. 32, *n.* 33. But even supposing that Professor Sayce had been able to make out a plausible case for Psammetichus I., the inferences which he draws would be entirely inadmissible—see Burney, *Expositor*, Feb. 1912, p. 98. On Archæology in relation to Pentateuchal Criticism in general see above, pp. 35–40.

[1] Jer. xliv. 1, 15.

[2] *Cf.* Andrews, *op. cit.*, p. 96, note to § 13.

[3] Burney, *Church Quarterly Review*, July 1912, p. 399. We need not pause to investigate how far Mr. McClure is justified in his statement

by Cambyses, it had subsequently been destroyed through the jealousy of the priests of Chnum, the ram-headed god of Yeb; and in Papyri 1 and 2 the Jews of Yeb requested Bagohi's permission to rebuild it: as Papyrus 3 shows, their request was granted. Now, in this latter papyrus the right to offer the *minḥāh* and 'frankincense' was accorded them. Burnt-offerings do not appear in this papyrus, but the offering of them is mentioned in ll. 25, 28 of Papyrus 1. Now in itself *minḥāh* may denote a sacrifice in general, and is so used in the early literature, yet its conjunction with frankincense suggests rather strongly the meal-offering (*cf.* Lev. ii. 1, 15, 16). But frankincense is mentioned in Jer. vi. 20; and the meal-offering is mentioned by Ezekiel in 572 B.C.,[1] evidently as a familiar species of sacrifice. Thus Ezekiel himself shows that it was in use some 130 years before P was promulgated; it is therefore one of the older elements incorporated in the legislation of P, and its mention in the papyri proves nothing about its antiquity that was not known before from the Old Testament itself!

It is, further, true that Papyrus 6, giving directions for the observance of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, alludes to the removal of leaven from the 15th to the 21st of the month, and to its close on Nisan 21, in agreement with Ex. xii. 15, 18 (P).[2] But it cannot be proved

that this temple was similar 'in structure to that of Jerusalem' (p. vi.). The papyri afford insufficient evidence for determining this; on the contrary, they might be held to suggest differences. But the question is, of course, quite beside the point.

[1] xlii. 13; xliv. 29, and repeatedly in chapters xlv. and xlvi. (for the date, see xl. 1).

[2] This papyrus is much mutilated, and all that now remains which is pertinent to our subject is: 'Now thus reckon ye four[teen days ?] . . . , and from the fifteenth day to the twenty-first of [Nisan] . . . be clean and be careful; work [do ye not]; . . . drink not; and anything

that this date was first *fixed* by P, and that, even if it had been so fixed, there would have been time for it to become known and observed in Egypt in 408 B.C.[1] There is, however, nothing arbitrary in the supposition that it had been fixed long before, and naturally, therefore, adopted, and formally prescribed, by P. It is too much to argue, as Professor Sayce does, that the institutions and sacrifices mentioned in the papyri show that "the ritual and prescriptions of the Levitical law were observed in the temple of Yahu at the southern extremity of Egypt just as they were in the post-Exilic Temple of Jerusalem"; [2] but some part of this ritual and of these prescriptions certainly was observed—notably, it is probable, that laid down in Lev. ii. and the adjoining chapters. There is in this, however, nothing inconsistent with the critical position. Have we not already seen that such individual laws, and particularly those in the early chapters of Leviticus, were taken over by P from earlier times and adopted by him as part of

wherein there is leaven [eat] not [from the fourteenth day of Nisan] from sunset until the twenty-first day of Nisan; . . . enter into your chambers, and seal (?) between the days of . . .' The Passover is also mentioned, though without any particulars as to its observance, on two ostraka from Egypt, namely, (1) Sachau, Tafel 64, No 2, inside, l. 5, and (2) Sayce, *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology*, 1911, pp. 183 ff.; Daiches, *ibid.*, 1912, pp. 17 ff. (where some important corrections appear); and Sayce, *ibid.*, 1912, pp. 212 ff.

[1] The papyri mentioned show that the Egyptian Jews kept in touch with their brethren in Palestine, and were interested in maintaining the religious observances of their nation.

[2] *The Expositor*, Aug. 1911, p. 114. Professor Sayce goes so far as to assert that these were observed at Yeb "as far back as the middle of the seventh century B.C." (*ibid.*). We have already shown how little justification there is for the supposition that the Jewish colonists were settled at Yeb in the reign of Psammetichus I.; it is also arbitrary to assert that observances in existence just before 408 B.C. were, *ipso facto*, in existence two hundred years before.

his own legislation upon the matters in question? In view of the quotation which appears above on p. 131 it is clear that Stade himself, though a critic believing fully in the Exilic date of P (in the proper sense of the expression, as explained above), would, if he were still alive, have been as ready as Professor Sayce to agree that the Jews of Yeb, in 408 B.C., could have known of ritual laws, such, *e.g.*, as that contained in Lev. ii. 1, 2. Professor Sayce evidently supposes critics to hold that the laws of P were the *creation* of the Exilic or post-Exilic age; but, as has been shown, this is not the case; the difficulties which he raises with regard to the critical date of P are consequently imaginary.

We may now pass on to consider the critical analysis and dating of the Pentateuchal documents in the light of the most trustworthy sources of Hebrew history existing in the Bible. In the first place, do the ancient historical sources for the period before Josiah's reign presuppose any knowledge of D and P, *i.e.* of their laws in the shape in which they occur in their respective systems, and with the formalities in which they are there clothed? We shall see that the answer to the question is in the negative. In the second place, does the usage of the period before Ezra and Nehemiah, as preserved in contemporary writings, presuppose P, *i.e.* the Priestly system and the Priestly laws, in the sense just indicated? The answer to this question is likewise in the negative. Thirdly, we must ask, do the contents of Ezra and Nehemiah and of other literary products of this late period betray any indications that P was promulgated at this time, and henceforth influenced all Jewish usage? To this question a very definite 'Yes' will have to be answered.

Of the manner in which *ancient* narratives have been incorporated in a Deuteronomic framework by the later editors of Judges or 1 and 2 Kings, and owe their present existence to such incorporation, something has been said on pp. 121 f. above. Moreover, the reader has already been warned that the present book aims at giving only a brief survey of the general features and results of the critical enquiry. Many points and side-issues, which in a larger volume would be dealt with in full, have here to be either entirely presupposed or merely alluded to in passing; this may be regrettable, but at the same time it is inevitable. If the reader is surprised at the brevity of the present treatment, if it seems to him that some aspects of the problem or some alternative interpretations of particular texts are passed over unnoticed, or if he does not fully realise the difference in value of various strata of the ancient traditions, or the nature of the framework of the books in which these traditions survive, he should at least not hastily assume that there are no grounds for the statements here made, much less that, because certain things seem to be taken as proven without a statement of the proof, no such proof is possible. Let him, on the contrary, seek for information in volumes which aim at a more exhaustive treatment of the subject, which deal at greater length with the individual points raised here, and which give a full statement of the reasons that dictate the results here presupposed.[1]

Let us take, then, the ancient traditions in the book of Judges. We notice that the conception of the Deity is that of neither D nor P: on the contrary, a high-minded

[1] Such works as A. T. Chapman, *op. cit.*, Carpenter and Harford, *op. cit.* (esp. pp. 132–41, 152, 245–64), the various volumes of the *International Critical Commentary*, or even the briefer studies of the various books in the *Century Bible*.

man such as Jephthah conceives of Chemosh, the god of Moab, and Jehovah as being both living deities, but as each possessing only circumscribed spheres of influence (Judg. xi. 24). The last-named is not pre-eminently either the God of Love delineated in Deuteronomy or the transcendent Deity of P; on the contrary, His home is conceived of as at Horeb or Sinai (Judg. v. 4, 5), and His relations with Israel are pre-eminently those of its war-god (*e.g.* Judg. i. 1 f.; v. 23).

Though sacrifice is often mentioned, no attempt is made to carry out the centralisation of worship which Deuteronomy proposed and P presupposed, and no consciousness is betrayed that such a law was even an ideal. On the contrary, Gideon and Manoah themselves offer sacrifice, and deem most suitable as places for such sacrifice those spots where a theophany has occurred, and a bare rock may serve as the altar (vi. 20; xiii. 19 f.)—quite in accordance with the terms of the 'Book of the Covenant': "An altar of earth thou shalt make unto me, and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt offerings, and thy peace offerings, thy sheep, and thine oxen: in every place where I record my name I will come unto thee and I will bless thee. And if thou make me an altar of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stones: for if thou lift up thy tool upon it, thou hast polluted it" (Ex. xx. 24, 25). Similarly Micah, full of zeal for Jehovah, owns a 'house of God' in his own home at his native Ephraimite village (Judg. xvii. 5, R.V. marg.). The tribe of Dan erects a tribal sanctuary in its northern territory, clearly as an act of devotion to Jehovah, not of apostasy from Him (Judg. xviii. 17–30).

This same great northern sanctuary, a royal one in later days (1 Kings xii. 29, 30), in boasting that its priesthood is descended from Moses (Judg. xviii. 30), shows

no interest in the *Levitical* status of that priesthood.[1] Indeed, by the choice of a lineal descendent of *Moses* (R.V. text correctly) the worshippers at this sanctuary reveal their ignorance of P's restriction of the priesthood to *Aaron's* descendants. Similarly the Ephraimite Micah had, at the outset, been able conscientiously to consecrate one of his own sons to the priestly office (Judg. xvii. 6), though he afterwards engaged a 'Levite' (xvii.), whom he clearly preferred, to act as priest (*v.* 13). This title, however, is evidently used here in the sense just indicated, namely to denote a *professional priest* rather than a member of the secular tribe mentioned in Gen. xlix. 5 ff.[2]

Although the argument from silence must be used with caution, the absence throughout Judges and Samuel of any references to the sacred arrangements and other regulations such as we have in P, *e.g.*, the restriction of sacrifice to the central sanctuary, the exclusive privileges of the sons of Aaron, *etc.*, is very remarkable: especially does the absence of such references in the account of Abinadab's treatment of the Ark, and in that of David's bringing the Ark up to Zion (2 Sam. vi.)—a great state occasion which we should expect to be marked by all the pomp that was possible—and the total absence of priests and Levites, and of the regulations of P for the bearing of the Ark, all point strongly to the fact that P's specific regulations did not as yet exist.[3]

[1] In Ex. iv. 14 ('Is there not Aaron, thy brother, the Levite?') the term 'Levite,' as it *distinguishes* Aaron from Moses, must be used to denote a profession, not membership in a tribe; see McNeile, *Exodus*, note, *ad loc.*

[2] See p. 101 above.

[3] The compiler of Chronicles remedies these defects: but if the two texts are carefully compared, it must be obvious that the additions and alterations have been made by him just to bring the occasion into

1 Sam. xxvi. 19,[1] moreover, reflects the same stage of religious belief with regard to God as does Jephthah's speech. Images still prevail (1 Sam. xix. 13).[2] Sacrifices are performed on an extemporised altar in the open field (1 Sam. vi. 14; xiv. 35), or on Araunah's threshing-floor (2 Sam. xxiv. 25), the scene, as it seems, of the great revelation to Abraham in still earlier times (Gen. xxii.), or at the 'Serpent's Stone' beside the 'Fuller's Well' (1 Kings i. 7, 9). Bethel is the goal of pilgrimages (1 Sam. x. 3),[3] as, like several other sanctuaries, it was in the days of Amos,[4] *i.e.* much nearer to the reign of Josiah, during which, on the critical hypothesis, Deuteronomy was promulgated expressly to abolish

conformity with what, according to P, it ought to have been (*cf.* 2 Chr. v. 4 with 1 Kings viii. 3, where 'Levites' for 'priests' *demonstrates* that he did make such alterations). It is noticeable also that in 1 Kings viii. 1–8 the LXX has a shorter text, which has every appearance of being original, and in which the expressions suggestive of P are not found ('congregation,' 'princes,' and 'Levites'): it is hardly likely that, had all these particulars been present in the Hebrew text which lay before the translators, they would have omitted them. See Skinner, *I and II Kings*, pp. 139–41, and Barnes, *Kings* (*Cambridge Bible*), p. 69, both of whom agree that the text of the LXX is original. On the Chronicler's use of Samuel and Kings, *cf.* pp. 15–19, 148 f.

[1] "Now therefore, I pray thee, let my lord the king hear the words of his servant. If it be the LORD that hath stirred thee up against me, let him accept an offering (*minḥāh*): but if it be the children of men, cursed be they before the LORD; for they have driven me out this day that I should not cleave unto the inheritance of the LORD, saying, Go, serve other gods."

[2] *Cf.* the many references to the Ephod (*e.g.* Judg. viii. 26 f., xvii. 4 f., xviii. 14; 1 Sam. ii. 28, xiv. 3, xxi. 9, xxiii. 6, 9, xxx. 7; *cf.* Hos. iii. 4), at least if this may be assumed to have been an image—a point on which the data are ambiguous, and opinions consequently divided. See Driver, *Exodus* pp. 312 f., with the references there cited.

[3] "Going up to God to Bethel"; note also the offerings they are taking with them. Note, too, in 1 Sam. ix. how 'the high place' is used for sacrificial purposes, and how Samuel takes the chief part in the ceremony (*vv.* 12–14, 19).

[4] *Cf.* Amos iii. 14, iv. 4, v. 5, 6, viii. 14; Hos. x. 15, *etc.*

such local sanctuaries. In the days of Elijah no Mosaic ordinance like that of Deut. xii., and much less P, could have existed; for Elijah, the guardian of all that was ancient and sublime and moral in Israel's religion at the time, goes so far as to bewail the overthrow of local sanctuaries: "And he said, I have been very jealous for the LORD, the God of hosts; for the children of Israel have forsaken thy covenant, *thrown down thine altars*, and slain thy prophets with the sword; and I, even I only, am left; and they seek my life, to take it away." He himself repairs, not to Jerusalem, but to an ancient sanctuary such as that of Beer-sheba (1 Kings xix. 3),[1] or to Jehovah's ancient desert-dwelling, Horeb (1 Kings xix. 8 f.). When he protests against the introduction of the foreign cult of the Tyrian Baals, or meets the prophets of the Ashērāh, he proves his contention that Jehovah is *the* God by rebuilding His ancient altar; and Jehovah shows that he approves his action and vindicates his contention by sending fire from heaven to consume His servant's sacrifice upon that altar.

Similarly the ordinary guilds of true prophets raised no outcry against local sanctuaries, or in favour of the restriction of the priesthood to "the sons of *Aaron*," or even to the *Levitical* guilds of priests. They made little or no advance upon the position of Samuel. He, we may remember, in 1 Samuel, though an Ephraimite (1 Sam. i. 1), and consequently not a member of the tribe of Levi, acted as a boy-priest at Shiloh (1 Sam. ii. 11, *etc.*), and slept beside the Ark (1 Sam. iii. 3) —a thing that would have been impossible if P had then been in force.[2] As he grows up and becomes a known

[1] *Cf.* Gen. xxi. 32 f.; xxii. 19; Amos v. 5; viii. 14, *etc.*, for the importance of this place.

[2] For a helpful *resumé* of the history and character of the Temple at Shiloh, see A. T. Chapman, *op. cit.*, pp. 192 ff.

leader of men, Samuel, the prophet and seer, takes it upon himself to conduct the sacrificial worship regularly at Ramah, and sometimes elsewhere, *e.g.* at Mizpah, Bethlehem, and Gilgal (1 Sam. vii. 9 ; ix. 12 ; xvi. 2, 5). He, moreover, sees nothing wrong in the king's performance of the priestly office (1 Sam. xiii. 9 ; xiv. 35 ; xv. 15, 22) ; when he does indeed reprove Saul for sacrificing, it is not because the latter, instead of sending for a Levite or for one of " the sons of Aaron," performs the act himself, but because he had not waited till Samuel's arrival for the latter to perform it (1 Sam. xiii. 8–14). So, too, the next king, David, devoted as he was to the religion of Jehovah, allowed his own sons to act as priests (2 Sam. viii. 18).

Hence after, as before, Solomon's erection of his Temple on Mount Zion, the same views prevail with regard to the legitimacy of worship at local sanctuaries and of the performance of the sacrificial act by non-professional, *i.e.* non-Levitical, persons. Indeed, Solomon himself gives no indication that he recognised even the presupposition of Deuteronomy that only the Levitical guilds (" the priests the Levites " in Deuteronomy) perform sacrifices, much less does he show that he recognised P's position that only " sons of Aaron " could sacrifice. He himself in his own new Temple, presumably because he is king and because the Temple is his property, acts at the very dedication service in the capacity of head-priest of the Temple. He himself performs the act of consecration, he himself offers the sacrifice, he himself gives the solemn blessing (1 Kings viii. 14, 64). Clearly, too, the Temple was intended by Solomon to be his own private and royal sanctuary, the charge of which he handed over to Zadok. Because it was his own private chapel, as it were, its total area was strictly limited, and it was erected in immediate

proximity to his own private residence and to that of his Egyptian wife, and one large outer court surrounded alike the single Temple enclosure on the north, and the enclosure in which Solomon's house was built, the Lebanon-wood House, the Hall of Justice, *etc.*, on the south.[1]

Much more might be mentioned in illustration of the fact that only gradually did the Levitical Guilds obtain the restriction of the priestly functions to their own members. The orders of these Levitical priests were equally valid, whether they were stationed at local sanctuaries or at the royal sanctuary, though naturally those of the latter, the sons of Zadok, had, socially at any rate, greater prestige than their provincial brethren. Other instances, too, might be quoted in illustration of the undoubted fact that up to the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign, the existence of the Temple never involved the non-existence of local sanctuaries, though, just because it was the royal sanctuary, it may have tended decidedly to eclipse such local sanctuaries as were situated in its more immediate neighbourhood. It must here suffice to point out that that new great line of inspired prophets who lived prior to Josiah's reign, and of whom Amos was the first, condemned the moral and religious abuses (Amos ii. 8, *etc.*) which had come to be inseparable from the existence of the local sanctuaries, but never condemned the mere local sanctuaries with a view to the furthering of the interests of the Temple at Jerusalem. The priesthood of the period is condemned in their writings not on the ground that it was not confined to " the sons of Aaron," or even to professional Levitical bodies, but on account of its worldliness and moral and religious laxity (*e.g.* Hos. iv. 6–8, vi. 9).

[1] See Skinner, *I and II Kings* (*Century Bible*), Appendix, pp. 440–2.

Let us now consider the reformation promoted by Josiah as the outcome of the finding in the Temple of the Law-Book (2 Kings xxii. 3–27). As S. Jerome[1] long ago recognised, the laws which that Book contained were those of Deuteronomy,[2] in fact the Law-Book was none other than the central portion of Deuteronomy itself. Josiah, besides purifying the Temple, completely abolished all local sanctuaries and profaned their sites with a view to securing their complete disuse.[3] The Temple alone survived; only there might the priesthood carry on its official duties.[4] The author of Deuteronomy sought to render impossible in the now purified religion of Jehovah any fusion with the Canaanite Baalism, nay more, either the survival in it, or the introduction into it, of foreign elements. Even the use of images of Jehovah was prohibited, nor was any consultation with the dead or other form of divination henceforth to be practised. The ensuing Passover was therefore kept solely, and by the whole people in solemn assembly, at Jerusalem, so that in Jerusalem "there had not been kept such a passover from the days of the judges that judged Israel, nor in all the days of the kings of Israel, nor of the kings of Judah" (2 Kings xxiii. 22).

The next prophet whose work has survived for us shows how speedily Deuteronomy, when once it had been promulgated, left its mark upon the writers of its own and the next generations. Jeremiah's thought and language are permeated with the thought and language crystallised in that book.[5]

[1] *De Cult. Fem.* 3.

[2] For the recognition of this by De Wette, see p. 31, *n.* 1. Even earlier in the seventeenth century Hobbes had made this same identification.

[3] 2 Kings xxiii. See Deut. xii. 1–4, *etc.*

[4] See Deut. xii. 5 ff.; xviii. 6–8, *etc.*

[5] See the references given above on p. 114, *n.* 3. Jer. xi. 1–6 seems to

But as we hasten forward to the Exile and beyond, we notice the rise of Ezekiel, whose relations with Deuteronomy are much less intimate, while his affinities with the 'Law of Holiness' are so remarkably and essentially close as to show that, in the Exilic circles to which the priestly Ezekiel belonged, Deuteronomy was less in the forefront than the 'Law of Holiness.'[1] Now so far in the historical documents and in the successive epochs of Hebrew history which have been under review from the period of the earliest settlement in Canaan to the very moment of the Exile, we have had no echo of that system of thought and of sacrificial worship which was enunciated with such definiteness and in such precise phraseology in P. And, while Ezek. xl.–xlviii. (dated B.C. 572) show us that a very considerable body of sacrificial and ceremonial institutions leading up to P was already in existence, these same chapters show that they had not reached the final and completely systematised form in which they ultimately appear in P. Moreover, after the gloom of disappointment has been dispelled by the Deutero-Isaiah, and even after it has resettled on the returned community in the sixteen years between 536 and 520 B.C., there is still no proof that the Priestly Code was as yet promulgated. Further, not even Haggai and Zechariah, writing between 520 and 516, presuppose that developed system of P which we have considered in the earlier pages of this book. They dream of a future in which Joshua and Zerubbabel on an equality rule the restored nation—a situation almost inconceivable if they had felt themselves bound by the requirements of P, which

refer definitely to the promulgation of Deuteronomy as a thing of the immediate past. On this point see H. Wheeler Robinson, *Deuteronomy* (*Century Bible*), 1907; A. S. Peake, *Jeremiah* (in the same series), vol. i., 1910; and especially Carpenter and Harford, *op. cit.*, pp. 146–52.

[1] See pp. 61–3.

involved that the high-priest alone should rule the Church-nation.

More striking still is the evidence afforded by Malachi (*c.* 450 B.C.), writing as he does on the very eve of Ezra's return. He regards the covenant of the priesthood as having been made with the whole tribe of Levi (ii. 4, 8; iii. 3; *cf.* Deut. xxxiii. 8). Again, in P, the priests' primary duties were sacrificial, and so less importance is there attached to the oral *Tōrōth* which the priests gave as administrators of Jehovah's *Tōrāh*; Malachi, however, agrees with the earlier customs in which the *oral* 'direction' of the priest was to the front (Mal. ii. 6; Hag. ii. 11;[1] Zech. vii. 3). The phraseology of Mal. iv. 4 is again that of the Deuteronomic school; notice in particular that the sacred mount where the Law was given is here called Horeb, as in Deuteronomy, not Sinai, as in P. The phrase 'statutes and judgements' in this verse occurs outside Deuteronomy in the whole of the Pentateuch only in the 'Law of Holiness' (Lev. xxvi. 46), but there one notes that the name of the sacred mount is Sinai, not Horeb as in this passage in Malachi and in D. The expression 'a peculiar treasure' (Hebr. *segullāh*), used in iii. 17, occurs nowhere in the Pentateuch except Ex. xix. 5 (E), Deut. vii. 6, xiv. 2, and xxvi. 18, where it is applied similarly. Again in ii. 13 *minḥāh* is used in the old wide sense.[2] A number of other instances occur of a preponderance of agreement with early, and particularly with Deuteronomic, phraseology.[3] On the other hand, this prophet presents us with some slight evidence (*e.g.* the 'tithes and heave-offerings'[4] in iii.

[1] Translate: 'Ask now direction of the priest.' See the *Century Bible, ad loc.*

[2] See above, p. 61.

[3] See notes to Mal. ii. 2, 4, iii. 5, 10, iv. 4 in *The Minor Prophets* (*Century Bible*), vol. ii.

[4] On this term see *H. D. B.*, vol. iii., p. 588a.

8, 10), that we are approaching the period at which we may expect the code of P to be promulgated; "the reference of Malachi may thus belong to an intermediate stage of practice out of which the regulations of P finally emerged."[1]

We may now turn to the moment when, as history shows us, P must have been promulgated. On the old New Year's Day, on the first of the seventh month and on the following day, probably at the end of September 444 B.C., Ezra read to the assembled people out of the 'Book of the Law.' Just as the promulgation of Deuteronomy had resulted in the observance of the Passover to which we have already referred, so as a result of Ezra's reading of this new law-book, the people immediately made preparations for the correct celebration of the Feast of Booths, in accordance with the regulations enjoined by it, in such a manner that "since the days of Jeshua the son of Nun, unto that day had not the children of Israel done so" (Neh. viii. 17).[2]

The literature of the subsequent period bears out the identification of the promulgation of P with this crisis in the history of the post-Exilic community. Chronicles, for example, we know to have been written at a subsequent date, in fact, well on in the post-Exilic period. The Priestly code lies behind it, for its compiler is saturated with Priestly thought. Not only does he regard it as the duty of his contemporaries to view their own actions and obligations from the point of view of the Priestly system of thought and ritual, but to him it is inconceivable that anything else than those should

[1] Carpenter and Harford, *op. cit.*, p. 256.

[2] Note, too, that Neh. viii. 15 is based on H (Lev. xxiii. 40–42), viii. 18b on P (Lev. xxiii. 39 end; Num. xxix. 35). See G. Buchanan Gray, art. LAW LITERATURE, in *Enc. Bibl.*, col. 2741.

have been the views ordinarily held by the noble characters and heroes of past generations or the real basis of their actions. Samuel is no longer a member of the tribe of Ephraim (1 Sam. i. 1, *etc.*), but of the tribe of Levi (1 Chron. vi. 19–28). David summons the priests and Levites to his assistance before he brings the Ark to its resting-place.[1] Many other instances could be quoted; but sufficient illustrations have now been given that the history of the Hebrews demands the publication of Deuteronomy in the reign of Josiah, while a consideration of the subsequent history of the race makes an equally cogent demand that we should admit that P was not promulgated before the days of Ezra and Nehemiah.

[1] *Cf.* above, p. 140, *n.* 3.

CHAPTER VII

THE DIVINE PURPOSE IN HEBREW RELIGION

THE last few pages contain a brief sketch of the manner in which the history of the chosen people bears out and emphasises the statements of the previous chapters with regard to the three lines of evidence afforded by the Pentateuch itself for the solution of the problems which it presents. We have thus, as fully as is possible in a book of the present size, enunciated these various arguments which in themselves compel a frank avowal of belief in the 'critical hypothesis.' The final justification of this belief must necessarily depend upon the extent to which the 'critical hypothesis' more effectively appeals to the moral and to the intellectual reason of the Christian believer than does the uncritical attitude of our opponents. For "truth in one department cannot be isolated from the whole body of truth, or indeed be fully grasped without an understanding of the whole." [1]

Hence this closing chapter is necessarily concerned with the relation in which, on the 'critical hypothesis,' the Hebrew religion stands to this indisputable fact of God's manifestation of Himself in Christ. Can the guiding hand of God be seen—is there progress discernible—between the beginnings of the Hebrew religion and the

[1] W. Temple, *The Divinity of Christ*, Essay V. in *Foundations*, 1912, p. 217. What Mr. Temple says on this page and the next, though concerned with a problem more vital to all of us, is for the most part remarkably applicable to our present investigation.

moment of the Incarnation? Is there, indeed, any real preparation, any real training of the chosen race for its high destiny? These are questions which we have now to bear in mind; for "critical methods are a means, not an end. Their object is to provide the material for rightly understanding documents, for constructing history, and formulating theology. The restoration of texts, the determination of their dates, and the analysis of their sources, are not the final object of the student's labour. It is useful work, it is attractive work, but it is not the highest work. What we want to know is by what way God revealed His will to ancient Israel, prepared the way for the Incarnation, laid deeply and surely the foundations upon which the Catholic Church was to be built."[1]

Moreover, apart from, and beyond, the question as to whether it is on the 'critical hypothesis' that the Hebrew religion in relation to Christianity is best understood, there also remains the necessity for striving rightly to realise that the Christian religion had its roots in an essentially Jewish soil; and that therefore this soil and all which went to produce it must be a matter of moment to the believer. Its Divine Head, born of a Jewish virgin, subjected Himself, alike in His childhood and in His manhood, to the sacraments of Judaism and to the observances of its ecclesiastical calendar. He expressed much of His teaching in the terminology of current Judaism; in this teaching He revealed His recognition of the fact that through the centuries His Father had

[1] A. F. Kirkpatrick, *The Inevitableness and Legitimacy of Criticism*, p. 30, Paper II. in *The Higher Criticism: Four papers*, by S. R. Driver and A. F. Kirkpatrick, new edition, 1912. All the four papers which are included in this work should be consulted by the reader who would realise the importance and scope of Higher Criticism for the settlement of present day difficulties connected with the Old Testament.

been preparing the world, particularly in and through the Jewish nation, for the stupendous culminating act of His own Incarnation. He taught that that gradual process of development in the past reached its climax in His own life and teaching. His immediate followers, too, interpreted His words in the same sense. The greatest of them recognised that 'the Promise' had been given *prior* to the establishment of 'the Law'; the latter was only 'the tutor' (Gal. iii. 23–29) appointed later to develop in humanity, by its own stern demands, ever increasing in their complexity, the consciousness that it needed a new means of obtaining righteousness —not through the Law, but through Faith. Again, we read in the Epistle to the Hebrews: "God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in his Son, whom he appointed heir of all things, through whom also he made the worlds." Hence, however much S. Paul and the author of this Epistle may, in the opinion of New Testament scholars, differ in their exposition of the manifold aspects under which God's gift of Himself to mankind may be described in human language, yet they do unmistakably agree in this issue which is so fundamental to us, viz. that the Christian stands outside the old preparatory Self-revelation of God,[1] secure within the kingdom of the Christ Who has redeemed him. He

[1] One has, of course, no desire to deny the real importance of the craving for union with God, and whatever success attended it, in Hinduism, Buddhism, among savage races, in early European religions, in Plato and Aristotle, in the Hellenic Mysteries, or, in atmospheres more akin to that of the Hebrews, in Egyptian, Babylonian, and general Semitic circles of religious thought. These religions are passed over in the present chapter merely because they are extraneous to the subject immediately in hand. For a brief survey of them in this connexion the reader should consult Stone and Simpson, *op. cit.*, pp. 1–47.

fully realises the wonders of God's grace when, and in so far as, he from time to time turns his gaze back to pre-Christian times. When he does this he marks that eternal light of which but a faint glimmer was apparent to Moses, which shone more clearly for the eighth-century prophets, which was reflected in the Deuteronomic law-book, and which illuminated with more intense splendour the Exilic prophets, throwing into bold relief the lights and shades of Jewish life, the ever-increasing consciousness of the barrier of sin, and the ramifications of Jewish legalism attempting to thrust that barrier aside. So we go back behind the period when men sought help in 'Wisdom' as the medium between God and man, back behind the period when apocalyptists sought to pierce the veil and looked forward to the Kingdom of which we are members. Christ's servants to-day, pressing ever further forward into the very stronghold of ignorance, darkness, and sin, find the greater inspiration and encouragement, the more critically and scientifically they study the record of God's ever-developing Self-revelation providentially proportioned to His people's increasing apprehension of it.

Let us first glance at the main outlines of Judaism as it existed in the time of our Lord. It had two great branches—Palestinian Judaism, and the side growth of Alexandrine philosophical and liberal Judaism, surviving to-day chiefly in Philo and a few stray phrases of the Epistle to the Hebrews. But even the simpler Palestinian Judaism had a highly developed dogma. It held a thoroughly monotheistic faith; it had a law-book, the absolute sanctity of which was deemed eternal; it had a Temple, to speak against which entailed death. Though subject to a great heathen Empire, its religion was so respected that not even the heathen Governor,

much less minor individuals, dared to enter beyond a certain point into that Temple. Separation from non-Jews had now become a presupposition of the faith; certain definite rites had to be observed before a non-Jew could be admitted into the community, as well as before each new generation of Jews came to be regarded as members of it. Moreover, a great strictness of life had always to be observed by the Jew. Certain Festivals were kept, and three times a year the whole male population were bidden to swarm to Jerusalem; even when at home, all were to observe with painful rigour the most stringent details of, *e.g.*, Sabbath observance. Moreover, one part at any rate of the nation not only affirmed the canonicity of the Pentateuch, but, with a progressiveness extremely objectionable to the Sadducean conservatives, also admitted the inspiration of many other books, some historical, some prophetic, some apocalyptic, and some of the 'Wisdom' tendency. Believing in the inspiration of these works, they naturally believed in the doctrines taught in them. Thus we find an apprehension of the worth of the individual soul; a belief in a kind of semi-hypostatised Wisdom or Spirit of God; in a resurrection; in a numerous body of angels and intermediary spirits; a confident expectation, on the part of some Jews at any rate, that a great day of reckoning was at hand in which either God Himself, or a Messiah divinely raised up for the purpose, would make the kingdom of the God of Israel co-extensive with the inhabited world. Some of them had noble ideas as to the conversion of the heathen and their participation in the privileges of Judaism, while others hoped with unpardonable self-satisfaction that they might be allowed to see the annihilation of the heathen.

By the aid of the methods of the 'higher critics,' which,

so far as the Pentateuch is concerned, have been exemplified in the preceding pages, it is possible to trace the gradual process of development, under God's special guidance, from the lowly origin of the Hebrews' religion to this rich inheritance of Judaism at the commencement of the Christian era. Not only is it possible to see how that great development was preparing for the birth of the world's Messiah at Bethlehem, for His rejection by His own nation, and His offer of Eternal Life to the whole of humanity, but we can even reconstruct with absolute certainty the main outlines and the more important stages of this progressive preparation.

It was at the sacred mount, known both as Sinai and as Horeb, that Jehovah made His solemn covenant or compact with the race whom He had chosen. It was at the same spot that, shortly before, revealing Himself amid the solitude of the wilderness, He had at the burning bush disclosed His Divine purpose to Moses, the shepherd and son-in-law of the Kenite Jethro, priest of Midian. Thus "that most important development was initiated which leads up through the later prophets to Jesus Himself."[1] Still unconscious possibly of all that that mighty name Jehovah meant, unconscious, too, of its infinite importance for the well-being of the whole human race to the end of time, and even beyond the grave, Moses had returned to Egypt, and, by Jehovah's all-powerful aid, had succeeded in leading his weary and jaded kinsmen to that holy spot. To Jethro this unmistakable manifestation of Jehovah's power made a peculiar appeal: "Now I know that Jehovah is greater than all gods" (Ex. xviii. 11). The Hebrews themselves, for the moment at any rate, were filled with feelings of genuine gratitude to Jehovah. But this

[1] Marti, *The Religion of the Old Testament*, 1907, p. 64.

did not necessarily mean any definite or violent breach with those old religious beliefs of theirs, which belonged to the circle of general Semitic folk-lore and unaided gropings after the Divine. And so their gratitude—momentary though it may have been—naturally found expression in the ancient act of homage to, and of communion with, the Deity: "And Jethro, Moses' father-in-law, took a burnt offering and sacrifices for God: and Aaron came, and all the elders of Israel, to eat bread with Moses' father-in-law before God" (Ex. xviii. 12). At Sinai-Horeb, then, it is that we may argue the dawn of a consciousness on Moses' part of that supernatural illumination which disclosed something of the ethical and moral attributes of the Godhead[1]—an illumination bright in comparison with the preceding darkness, though merely a faint glimmer when compared with the full glory of the Incarnation. Thus receptive, at any rate for the moment, of this Divine Self-revelation, the people are capable of being admitted to the first steps of that long process which was destined gradually to lead up to the Christian Faith. The solemn covenant is entered upon by both Jehovah and the people; regulations are laid down which they on their part must observe; Jehovah on His side binds Himself to certain obligations towards Israel. A solemn sacrifice, sealing the covenant, is the climax of this great moment in the history of the human race (Ex. xxiv. 5). Thus, whatever else was involved, the new religion was definitely stamped as sacrificial and sacramental.

But what exactly was involved then and through the centuries that followed, right up to the new impetus imparted to religion by the fresh inrush of inspiration that animated Amos and the other early writing prophets?

[1] *Cf.* C. G. Montefiore, *Hibbert Lectures* for 1892, pp. 46 f., 50.

However transient and short-lived may have been the actual gratitude of the whole people to Jehovah, the inauguration of the covenant at Sinai-Horeb was momentous in its consequences. What it involved was, in a word, on their part an act of free choice of Jehovah as their God, and on His part the free choice of Israel to be His people, a choice involving a definite expression of good-will and affectionate regard. Hence He is their 'Father' and they are His 'sons'—"Thus saith Jehovah, Israel is my son, my firstborn" (Ex. iv. 22). It is to this primitive and characteristic aspect of Jehovah's relationship to Israel and of Israel's to Him that Hosea, centuries afterwards, would recall His people: "When Israel was a child, then I loved him and called my son out of Egypt" (xi. 1).

So far as the Hebrews of those earliest days were concerned, the revelation of Jehovah at Sinai-Horeb raised their religious ideals above those implied by a point of view not uncommon among ancient nations. That old view regarded the Deity as literally the actual, physical, progenitor of the tribe or nation, and the tribe or nation as, literally, his actual, physical, children. Hence by the side of the God-Father there often stood the Goddess-Mother, who was regarded as having in a material and physical manner given birth to the tribe or nation.[1] But, from the first, Jehovah's fatherly relation to Israel was always conceived by His true worshippers as a moral relation, implying paternal affection and regard on the one hand and the duties of filial obedience on the other. And the consciousness of Jehovah as an ethical and moral Deity for ever excluded, at least from the minds of all good men who worshipped Him

[1] See W. Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, revised edition, 1907, pp. 55–62.

as such, the thought of a female deity side by side with Him.

Such primitive gropings after the Divine as were embodied in totemism, animism, and ancestor-worship, to some small extent still survived. The religion of the Hebrews in the period immediately subsequent to Jehovah's Self-revelation at Sinai-Horeb embraced no doctrine of a future life with which to comfort its adherents; nor was there as yet any developed doctrine of guardian angels, commissioned to watch over the welfare of individuals. The individual, in fact, counted for nothing, except in so far as he was a member of the nation and was physically fit to fight the battles of Jehovah, the God of his nation, against the ceaseless encroachments of other nations, whose military hosts were the servants of other gods. Those gods, so far as the Hebrew warrior knew, were only a little less powerful than Jehovah, but equally alive, gods whose very existence, like Jehovah's own, was bound up, in the estimation of the Hebrew of this period, with the existence of the peoples whose respective deities they were.[1]

Consequently the sublime thought, embryonic as it was, of Jehovah as the ethical and moral Deity, the Father of His *adopted*—not physically generated—child, the Hebrew race, tended to recede into the background in the minds of all but a few outstanding characters of subsequent generations, such as Samuel or David. As He fought their battles, He was to an ever increasing

[1] See the brief but wonderfully helpful sketch of *The Rise of the Hebrew Religion*, by Dr. A. S. Peake, in the first chapter of his *Religion of Israel* (*The Century Bible Handbooks*), 1908. See further, Budde, *Religion of Israel to the Exile*, 1899, pp. 1–38; Kautzsch, art. RELIGION OF ISRAEL in *H. D. B.*, extra vol., pp. 612–34.

extent looked upon as a *war-god*. He tended to become in their eyes—

> "The mere barbaric God of Hosts
> That edged their sword and braced their thew;
> A God they pitted 'gainst a swarm
> Of neighbour gods less vast of arm."

True, they held communication with Him by means of the outward forms of their sacrificial and sacramental worship at local sanctuaries, by means of the oracle at those sanctuaries, by the visitations of His Angel, by the use of images of Him which went far to provide a useful medium for the realisation of His presence amongst them. But in so far as the Hebrew people regarded Him simply and entirely as their war-god, they felt themselves free, nay probably bound, to pay homage also to the native deities of the territory which their war-god gave them, since those native deities, it seemed to them, controlled the reproductive forces of nature, the fertility alike of their fields, of their animals, and of their own race. Hence Israel could indeed say: "I will go after my lovers that give me my bread and my water, my wool and my flax, mine oil and my drink" (Hos. ii. 5), while by a perverted religious instinct horrible to contemplate, her "daughters commit whoredom," and her "brides commit adultery," and "they themselves go apart with whores, and they sacrifice with the harlots"[1] (Hos. iv. 13, 14). Even in Judah immorality in the name of religion was not unknown from time to time (1 Kings xiv. 24; xv. 12; xxii. 46; *cf.* 2 Kings xxiii. 7); and the writings of Isaiah, Micah and other prophets show us how bad in their day was the religious and social condition of this kingdom. The Southern kingdom, however, even in the prosperous

[1] Heb. *ḳedēshāh*; see Gen. xxxviii. 21, R.V. marg.

and comparatively luxurious days of Uzziah, whatever was the case in Manasseh's time, seems never to have equalled in luxury or in general sinfulness the less insignificant Northern kingdom,[1] which reached the zenith of its prosperity in the reign of Jeroboam II.[2]

Against all such degradation no *human* effort could avail. The priesthood, guard itself as it increasingly did by emphasising the distinction to be drawn between its own body and the laity, was inevitably on the side of many of the abuses of the times, which, as Amos and Hosea urged, even when they did nothing worse, divested sacrifice and other religious observances of all moral and spiritual value. Hosea, whose knowledge of the Northern priestly guilds seems to have been very extensive and accurate, condemns them because "they feed on the sin of my people, and set their heart on their iniquity" (Hos. iv. 8). Micah again condemns with no less severity those of the Southern kingdom, along with its secular leaders and its prophets of the ordinary type: "The heads thereof give judgment for reward, and the priests thereof give direction for hire, and the prophets thereof divine for money" (Mic. iii. 11).

Such, then, was the environment into which were projected the new truths concerning Himself, His purpose, and His requirements from His people, which Jehovah now revealed through the eighth-century prophets. Of the reality of the prophetic inspiration and of the recognition of it by critics enough has been said above on pp. 116–20. Space will allow of only brief reference to the individual teaching of Amos and Hosea in the North,

[1] *Cf.* Dr. Foakes-Jackson, *Our Debt to Northern Israel*, in *The Interpreter*, April 1913.

[2] On the religion of Israel in Canaan in the pre-prophetic period, pp. 634–71 of the article by Kautzsch already referred to should be consulted. *Cf.* Budde, *op. cit.*, pp. 39–111; Marti, *op. cit.*, 72–123.

and of Isaiah in the South. Amos, "a puritan in his conception of God and an austere judge in his stern and unyielding attitude towards his own people," put before them, for the first time in their history, the real significance of the *righteousness* of Jehovah's nature, and the resultant obligations incumbent upon Israel as a party to the ancient covenant with that righteous God: "You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore"—so far from overlooking your moral and religious short-comings, as you fondly imagine I do on account of my choice of you as my people, on the contrary—"I will visit upon you all your iniquities" (Am. iii. 2).

Possibly Amos went too far in so strongly repudiating the positive as well as the negative aspects of the nation's religious experience. Others had to come after him, through whom the truths with which they were inspired received less imperfect expression, and who were Jehovah's vehicles for the revelation of other aspects of His nature.

Hosea, for instance, divinely taught by the melancholy experiences of his own domestic sorrows, by his own intense love for his wife in spite of her infidelity,[1] was inspired to communicate to His people the fuller revelation of God's all-absorbing love for them. Its necessary corollary, he taught, was their whole-hearted love of Jehovah, and, based upon that, as the panacea for the social and moral abuses within the state, an unselfish love for one another. Thus Hosea did his part to fill up what was lacking in his great predecessor. He had further new ideals to put forward, but "it is less in ideas than in apt terms to express them that the prophets advance on one another. Amos speaks of the

[1] On Hosea's marriage see A. B. Davidson, art. HOSEA, in *H. D. B.*, vol. ii. pp. 421 f.

goodness of Jehovah, Hosea first calls it 'love'; Amos inculcates compassion, 'humanity,' Hosea first finds the right word for this (חֶסֶד,[1] iv. 1). On the other hand, while Hosea laments the want of trust in Jehovah revealed in the foreign alliances of Israel, it is Isaiah that first uses the positive word '*faith*' (vii. 9)." [2]

It was, indeed, at the moment when Isaiah and Ahaz met "at the conduit of the upper pool in the highway of the fuller's field" that "the conception of religious faith was born." [3] It was through Isaiah that Jehovah first revealed to His people the Divine principle that the spiritually fit should survive—the doctrine of 'the Remnant.' But it is in ch. vi. of his book that he describes what he regards as the fundamental characteristic of the Divine nature—holiness in its deepest and most essential significance, no longer a merely physical quality,[4] but the highest ethical and moral attribute of the Godhead. A real attempt to approximate to this Divine holiness is, therefore, demanded also of man; and for this to be possible the terrible burden of sin must be removed. Such was the prophet's own experience at the moment

[1] *I.e.* 'loving-kindness.' The rendering of this word in the Revised Version is not uniform, see, *e.g.*, Hos. ii. 19 ('loving-kindness' of God); vi. 4 ('goodness'), 6 ('mercy'); but *kindness* is added on the marg. on both these passages to indicate that the Hebrew is in each case the same; x. 12 ('mercy'); xii. 6 ('mercy').

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 425.

[3] See Budde, *op. cit.*, p. 150. The sense of the expression 'believe' in Gen. xv. 6, Ex. iv. 5, 31, xiv. 31, Num. xiv. 11 seems in no way to contradict or to antedate this fuller and specialised conception which owes its rise to Isaiah.

[4] The Hebrew root from which the adjective meaning 'holy' is derived seems originally to have had the connotation of merely *physical* separation for the use of a god. See Skinner, art. Holiness, in *H. D. B.*; Sanday and Headlam, *Epistle to the Romans*, 1895, note to i. 7.

of his call; and his recital of it shows that in his estimation a similar experience was a necessity for his fellow-countrymen, if they would indeed seek for the establishment of right relations between themselves and their God. Isaiah, too, it was who first delineated a Messiah of God-like proportions, an adumbration of the figure of the Christ Who came only after the lapse of seven long centuries, during which His people's consciousness of sin and their realisation of the impassable barrier which it erected had been more fully developed through the medium of yet other inspired prophets and of legislative enactments intended to regulate their lives.

In another matter Isaiah influenced his own generation more immediately. His doctrine of the inviolability of Jerusalem because its Temple was Jehovah's dwelling, together with the fact that that Temple had been the scene of his great inaugural vision, must have gone far to lead the Deuteronomic reformers to the conclusion that the Temple, the worship of which could be minutely regulated by royal decree, should in future be the *sole* place where the sacrificial and sacramental side of their religion might be perpetuated.

When, then, did the reformation take place? Conceivably some attempt was made to effect it during Hezekiah's reign, in Isaiah's own life-time. But before any such definite reformation, with actual and abiding results, was destined to be carried out, the spiritually-minded who yearned for it had to pass through the still darker days of Manasseh's reign. The ranks of good men were thinned, and the social, moral, and religious condition of the whole people was darker than ever before. The people became dead to all but the externals of a debased sacrificial ceremonialism, a condition of things tragically and dramatically reflected in a prophecy which

appears in the sixth chapter of Micah. There the people are made to enquire (*vv.* 6, 7) :—

> " Wherewith shall I come before Jehovah
> And bow myself before the High God ?
> Shall I come before Him with burnt offerings,
> With calves of a year old ?
> Will Jehovah be pleased with thousands of rams,
> Or with ten thousands of rivers of oil ?
> Shall I give my first-born for my transgression,
> The fruit of my body for the sin of my soul ? "

To this the pious band who still treasured a recollection of Amos' doctrine of righteousness, of Hosea's of loving-kindness, and of Isaiah's of humility as the correlative of Jehovah's holiness, in the name of true religion gave the bold and memorable answer (*v.* 8) :—

> " He hath showed thee, O man, what is good :
> And what doth Jehovah require of thee ?
> But to do righteousness, and to love loving-kindness,
> And to walk humbly with thy God."

The struggle was now no longer one between the exponents of the higher and moral type of the religion of Jehovah and those who favoured a crass and immoral interpretation of its sacrificial worship. The present fight, on the contrary, lay between those who, to whichever of these earlier parties they had belonged, now definitely refused to accept, and those, on the other hand, who favoured, Manasseh's attempt to reduce Jehovah to the status of a mere member of his Pantheon—whether they regarded Him as inferior or superior to, or on an equality with, the sun, moon, and star deities who were His colleagues in this strange assembly of gods.[1]

Thus, for the first time since Amos had initiated the

[1] See the interesting reconstruction of Manasseh's reign in Budde, *op. cit.*, pp. 163–69.

higher interpretation of Hebrew religion, men of prophetic and priestly leanings found themselves in alliance against a common foe. In fact, the conscience of at any rate a section of the priestly class was probably aroused at last. Though no record remains of their earlier self-reform in consequence of the teaching of Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah, Manasseh's pagan propaganda made them realise the true issue—between the recognition of Jehovah's moral claims on the one hand, and, on the other, the supersession of His worship by that of new gods of foreign origin. Thrown into alliance in this manner, and having the restoration and reform of the true religion as their common objective, prophetic reformers and priestly sympathisers set out to draw up a new law-book. Even if "loving-kindness and not sacrifice, and the knowledge of God rather than burnt-offerings,"[1] should be rightly interpreted as an illustration of the complete abandonment by the great prophets of all belief in the sacramental efficacy of the sacrificial worship, that was not the case with this pious kernel of the nation who treasured their inspired words. Their leaders determined to draw up this law-book with a view to the expression and crystallisation in it, and therefore even in the sacrificial worship itself, of the truths which these great teachers had enunciated. It was designed to bring about, when once Manasseh's strange travesty of religion was a thing of the past, the reforms necessary to actualise the ideals of those great prophets in all departments of life. Thus it would supersede "the covenant which he made with them in Horeb" (Deut. xxix. 1).

The pious band pursued their labours amidst per-

[1] Hos. vi. 6; *cf.* Amos v. 25 (R.V. marg.); Isa. i. 10–17; Mic. vi. 8 (quoted above).

secution and hourly danger of proscription and martyrdom. This undoubtedly accounts for the stowing away of the finished work in some safe hiding-place in the Temple. Possibly, too, these compilers of Deuteronomy soon afterwards paid for their faith with their lives; for "Manasseh shed innocent blood very much, till he had filled Jerusalem from one end to another" (2 Kings xxi. 16).

In any case the law-book of Deuteronomy was not discovered in the Temple till its repair was undertaken in the reign of Manasseh's grandson, Josiah.

Enough has already been said[1] as to its contents and their relationship to the 'Book of the Covenant.' The prophets' teaching was now crystallised in legislation. Hosea's primary demand for loving-kindness had been made the main motive for the observance of this legislation. A kind of instinctive, and even, to some great extent, explicitly defined, monotheism was there recognised. In it the moral nature and the moral claims of the Godhead were also acknowledged; hence according to it sacrificial ritual must be accompanied by a real spiritual intention on the part of the offerer; while the centralisation of the worship at Jerusalem was intended to make the immoral accompaniments of the worship at the local sanctuaries henceforth impossible. The claims and rights of the individual are affirmed more emphatically than had ever been done before: "fathers shall not be put to death for sons, nor sons for fathers" (Deut. xxiv. 16); and humanitarian ideals, as we have seen, are inculcated in every department of life.

With Jeremiah,[2] whose intimate connection with

[1] See above, pp. 106–10.

[2] See A. S. Peake, *Jeremiah* (*Century Bible*), vols. i. and ii., and A. B. Davidson, art. JEREMIAH, in *H. D. B.*

Deuteronomy, and close dependence upon it, have been referred to more than once, this great epoch in the development of Hebrew religion draws near its close. Jeremiah, in fact, has behind him the actual results of the teaching of Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah, as incorporated in Deuteronomy; it is his duty to give them their proper light and shade. Prophecy had already taught its truths; Deuteronomy had imprinted them on human conduct; and now they are revealed in the actual life of an individual human being. This wonderful realisation of religion in his own spiritual life and of union with God in his intercession with Him on behalf of his people (chs. xiv., xv.), carried Jeremiah a step further than his predecessors in his teaching as to the relation of individuals to God, irrespective of their membership in the nation. But here he stops; for in his impassioned description of the 'New Covenant' (xxxi. 31–34) which is to be written on men's hearts[1] he makes no mention of participation in that Covenant by the Gentiles, though on the other hand in ii. 11, xii. 15 f., xvi. 19, he hints at this.

Jeremiah's inspiration, therefore, pauses, as it were, on the threshold which leads from the outer court of purely national religion into the inner shrine of personal individual faith. His teaching in this respect was destined to be carried forward by Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah.[2]

To the former, exiled to Babylon in 597 B.C., and living in the same priestly circles as had produced the 'Law of Holiness,' fell the difficult task of setting

[1] He recognises the *heart* as the centre of man's spiritual life (iv. 14; xvii. 9, *etc.*), and therefore as the especial object of Jehovah's scrutiny (xi. 20; xvii. 10; xx. 12).

[2] A convenient designation of the author of Isa. xl.–lv., who wrote in the closing years of the Exile.

forth a *rationale* of the nation's misfortunes, the transcendent nature of Jehovah and His sole Godhead, a synthesis of the ethical and sacramental elements in religion and of the ethical and physical connotation of holiness, and an idealised description of the Judaism of the future after its restoration to Palestine.[1]

To Deutero-Isaiah was entrusted the task of giving to Judaism its devotional and mystical tendencies,[2] and at the same time of offering it the possibility of a thoroughly liberal outlook. It is his note of univeralism that is re-echoed in some of the Psalms; they probably owe to his inspiration much also of their grand expression of Jehovah's loving-kindness. It is his insistence on his people's destiny as emphatically the great missionary race of the world which could carry thoughts such as those contained in Jer. xii. 15 f. or xviii. 7, 8 to their logical conclusion. Again it is only Deutero-Isaiah's influence upon the Judaism of the immediate future which could have made possible the composition and publication of Jonah. Once more, in still later days, in spite of the narrowing influence of the Maccabæan period, his ideals reappear in more than one tractate of a liberal and spiritual nature.[3]

Moreover, Deutero-Isaiah was inspired to give a deeper and fuller explanation than Ezekiel of the real inner meaning of Jehovah's purpose in permitting His chosen people to be transplanted by their foes from their own native soil to that of Babylonia. Like Ezekiel he recognised in the Exile an element of punishment; in the sufferings which it entailed he saw even the *double*

[1] See F. J. Foakes-Jackson, Essay II. in *The Parting of the Roads*, 1912, where Ezekiel's place in the religious development of this period is admirably drawn out.

[2] *Cf.* Stone and Simpson, *op. cit.*, pp. 124–36.

[3] See Whitehouse, *Isaiah* (*Century Bible*), vol. ii. pp. 39–46.

payment of the penalty (Isa. xl. 2). Like Amos, he fully recognised righteousness as a fundamental element in the Divine nature; and on that recognition he based his conviction that Jehovah would immediately restore His people to Palestine. In ch. xlviii. we meet with the same belief as in Ezekiel, that 'for His Name's sake' the gracious process of His Self-revelation through Israel will be continued even in the future, in spite of their failure in the past to assimilate it in all its increasing fulness. But it is in the 'Servant-songs' above all that the perfect ideal of humility, unselfishness, persistent righteousness (xlii. 1–4), world-wide mission (xlix. 1–6), unswerving faith in spite of scorn (l. 4–10), the vicariousness of suffering, and the glorious destiny resulting from self-sacrifice and martyrdom (lii. 13–liii. 12), are for the first time in the world's history expressed in unambiguous terms. Whatever then their original reference—some ideal of Israel or of its religious kernel, or even of the prophetic order—it is, roughly speaking, from this period of the Exile that there emanate those lofty ideals which were ultimately to play so large a part in the Church's appreciation and expression of the meaning of the Incarnation.

It was, therefore, Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah who, building on Jeremiah's summing-up of the previous Self-revelation by Jehovah of His attributes and His purpose for Israel, gave expression to the views which, so far as was possible in the case of such ideals, were to be incorporated in P. It was, in short, their inspired teaching as to the transcendent nature of Jehovah, His incomparable Godhead, His sole sovereignty over the whole universe, which, together with the other complementary truths that each contributed, laid the foundations of the Judaism of our Lord's time. Others too

there were who cannot be mentioned individually here; these, though in a lesser degree than those great pillars of Judaism, one and all contributed their share to the religious experience of their race and of the world, and take their places as inspired prophets and teachers within one or other of these great epochs in the long vista of Hebrew religious development.

Such was the gradual growth of the Hebrew religion from its lowly origins at Sinai-Horeb, nearly a thousand years before, to this strong and vigorous system at the beginning of the post-Exilic Period. We cannot but have seen that this growth was at every step due, not simply to that divine process so often termed 'the general providence of God,' but also to Jehovah's direct interposition through His prophets. We also notice how, in spite of such direct interposition, the chosen race from time to time fell back, and even seemed for the moment to lose the heritage of which it was the heir. Yet history proves that such momentary set-backs have ever been but the preludes to forward movements in which the forces of religious progress, having gathered fresh strength, have advanced to yet further victories, and have in the end achieved fresh conquests for the cause of the Kingdom of Heaven. Thus, for instance, after the Nicene Council in 325 A.D. the Christian Church went forward through the dark and gloomy days of Arian supremacy to the fuller and Catholic expression of the metaphysical truths of the Incarnation. Again, after the separation between intellect and popular thought in the Middle Ages she awakened to a wider realisation of her mission to the intellectual needs of mankind in general. She had yet to recover her still more important and essential evangelical and sacramental functions. For, a hostile opponent might possibly

urge, with some justification in England at any rate, she lapsed for a time into almost complete carelessness as to her sacramental, devotional, and evangelistic mission. To the importance of the last element she was awakened by the Evangelical revival of the eighteenth century, to that of the sacramental by the Tractarian Movement, and to the devotional purpose of her being by both. Naturally neither Protestantism nor Catholicism claims for itself that it is unconnected with primitive Christianity; on the contrary "Catholicism equally with Protestantism claims to find its starting-point in the Church of New Testament times; the germs both of sacramentalism and of institutionalism are to be found within the pages of the New Testament."[1] Thus alternations of development and retrogression are to be found even in the history of the Christian Church.

In like manner, also, between the time of Ezekiel or Deutero-Isaiah and the coming of Christ we see the ebb and flow of religious thought, the alternations in religious life. Early in this period it was that men's lives began to be regulated by the Priestly Code, a system scientifically elaborated and in the doctrinal sphere more advanced than the prophetic law-book of Deuteronomy, and an attempt, moreover, to translate into practice the new religious ideals resulting from the experiences and teachings of the Exile and especially from the pronouncements of Ezekiel. At times partial success, often complete failure, attended the efforts of the Jew, thus aided, to act and to think religiously.[2] As generations passed by, the various streams of Jewish

[1] A. E. J. Rawlinson, *The Principle of Authority*, Essay VIII. in *Foundations*, 1912, p. 401.

[2] In addition to the enactments of the Priestly Code discussed in previous chapters of the present book, see, for a logical survey of it as a whole, Kautzsch, *H. D. B.*, extra vol., pp. 715–723.

religious thought at times intermingled, at times pursued each its distinct course. New points of view arose, the old maintaining their hold on some of the chosen race, and in the case of others giving place to these newer modes of thought or combining with them. The legalist, on the one hand, whose religion began and ended with the Law—the *Tōrāh*, as it was called—"firmly believed that God Almighty was both a diligent student of the *Tōrāh*, and also *Himself* obeyed its precepts." For him, "the essence of Jewish piety consisted in love to the *Tōrāh*. Faith, Obedience, Love, and every virtue, had as their condition single-hearted observance of the *Tōrāh*. All that was done in the way of what was right was done in reference to the *Tōrāh*; the whole of man's relations with God were conditioned by faithful adherence to the *Tōrāh*; it was the guide in all things, heavenly as well as earthly. This is pointedly brought out in St Paul's words: *so that the Law has been our tutor to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But now that faith is come, we are no longer under a tutor* (Gal. iii. 24, 25)."[1]

At the other extreme might be seen one who, finding failures, disappointments, and inexplicable social anomalies everywhere around him, had, in his quest for a solution of the problems of life, lost his belief not only in the intrinsic value of the Law, but also in the inherent beauty of life and of nature itself. Human activities, human pleasures, and human struggles, drew from him but one unvarying cry: "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity." There were others, however, of a less pessimistic turn of mind—Ben-Sirah, the author of *Ecclesiasticus*, for example, who attained a happier combina-

[1] Oesterley and Box, *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue*, 1907, p. 143.

tion of trustful confidence in the *Tōrāh*, and of a practical belief that men's conduct must also be directed by a dispassionate and common-sense view of human life. There were others, again, who, along with greater or less respect for the *Tōrāh*, developed a speculative belief in a personified or even hypostatised principle of 'Wisdom'—the transcendent God's assistant in Creation in the past, and the medium of His intercourse with man in the present. Of this the Palestinian production, Proverbs i.–ix., and the fine Alexandrine composition of the Book of Wisdom, are excellent examples.[1] The influence of this more or less philosophical interest in 'Wisdom' upon the literature of the New Testament is apparent in the New Testament writings themselves.[2]

Only one other development now needs to be set in its proper place in God's scheme of preparation for the Incarnation and man's realisation of its significance. This took its rise as a positive force for good in Jewish religion in days the very darkness of which gave the greater opportunity for genuine piety and for the realisation of religious truth. For instance, when, in 168 B.C., that 'crowned apostle of Hellenism,' Antiochus Epiphanes, profaned Jehovah's altar at Jerusalem by superimposing upon it an altar to Zeus Olympius, the Jews' religious instincts as well as their national pride cried out against this act of blasphemy. Judas Maccabæus

[1] For a discussion of the teaching of the Book of Wisdom see S. Holmes, THE WISDOM OF SOLOMON, in the Oxford *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, vol. i., pp. 527–533, or A. T. S. Goodrick, *The Book of Wisdom* (*The Oxford Church Bible Commentary*), 1913. On the 'Wisdom' tendency in general, see C. H. Toy, *Enc. Bibl.*, coll. 5322–36, Kautzsch, *H. D. B.*, extra vol., pp. 728–732.

[2] See J. Moffatt, *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, 1911, pp. 25 ff.

raised the standard of revolt, and the godly flocked to his support, to fight for 'the law and the ordinances,' for all that was noble in their religious inheritance. So in similar later crises they were drawn closer than ever before to the God Whom the apostate Jew and the persecuting foe blasphemed. They distrusted the old optimistic belief of the prophets, constantly reiterated but never fulfilled, that the foe would speedily be vanquished, and that as a nation they would at once enjoy unexampled prosperity. For they themselves were dying, and dying too not for their sins but for their religion; and such unmerited suffering rendered them the more responsive to the fuller teaching as to Himself which God was ever ready to bestow upon them. Now it was that they could appreciate the revelation of truths so supernatural and transcendental that they were only capable of being revealed to them by the help of strange imagery and a type of allegory essentially new; hierarchies of angels and powers, heavenly guardians of the faithful, and dread bearers of Divine punishment for the foe; the supernatural Messiah, Who, in place of the Warrior-Christ of ancient prophecy, would descend from heaven to end their final tribulation; the catastrophic annihilation of the present world and the substitution of the New Jerusalem for the old prophetic ideal of a Jewish kingdom in this world; a personal resurrection for the martyr and even for the ordinary individual believer in Jehovah; and a retribution awaiting the apostate and the persecutor. Such are the more important features of Apocalyptic, the successor to Prophecy. Like the prophets, the Apocalyptic writers believed themselves to be—and actually were—uttering a divinely inspired revelation of the will and purposes of God, for "through them, in so far as the human

intellect and emotions could appropriate it, Jehovah was making known the nature of His kingdom."[1]

When the pre-existent Messiah actually came to earth, the form and matter of His teaching revealed how fully He endorsed the Divine principles in the development of Hebrew religion, thus slowly and gradually manifested, especially in the case of Apocalyptic. The writings of His more immediate followers also bear witness to the fact that Jewish Apocalyptic, at least in the most vigorous and missionary period of the Church's existence, was an essential part of her organic and spiritual life.

Thus 'criticism' indeed answers the test which we laid down at the beginning of this chapter. It helps us to realise more fully that the Catholic Religion had its origins not in Hellenic Mysteries or in any kind of pagan environment, but specifically in a Hebrew environment which God, in fulfilment of His Divine purpose, had prepared through the inspiration of the Prophet, the discipline of the Law, the teaching of 'Wisdom,' and the utterances of the Apocalyptists.

[1] Stone and Simpson, *op. cit.*, p. 87; *cf.* the whole section, pp. 86–93. On Jewish Apocalyptic the reader should consult R. H. Charles, *Eschatology*, 2nd edition, revised and enlarged, 1913; for Jewish life and literature in general in post-Exilic times, W. Fairweather, *The Background of the Gospels*, 1908, Oesterley and Box, *op. cit.*, H. F. Hamilton, *The People of God*, vol. i., 1912, H. Wheeler Robinson, *The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament*, 1913, and A. Nairne, *The Faith of the Old Testament*, 1914.

APPENDIX

THE NAMES OF GOD IN THE PENTATEUCH

REFERENCE has already been made on pp. 25–28, 55–58, 72–74 to the part played by the alternation of the Divine names in the discovery of the sources of Gen. i.–Ex. vi. 3, and, in some cases, in the analysis of JE after this point.[1] The following pages contain a brief review of the attempts which have recently been made to invalidate the evidence derived from this phenomenon, and also a brief summary of the facts and considerations which show that these efforts both have failed and, from the nature of the case, are necessarily foredoomed to fail.

The attempts in question consist essentially in the endeavour to show that there are so many variants in the Divine names, especially in Gen. i.–Ex. vi., in the Greek version, commonly called the 'Septuagint' (LXX),[2] or in particular MSS. of the LXX, and sometimes also in other Ancient Versions, and occasionally in Hebrew MSS. as well, that they prove the official or 'Massoretic' Hebrew text (MT.)[3] to be far too uncertain for any reliance to be placed on the varying use of the Divine names occurring in it as a mark of differences of authorship. The principal writers on the subject are H. M. Wiener[4] and Johannes

[1] In P, it will be remembered, after Ex. vi. 2a, *Jehovah* is always used; so that *God* (*'Elōhim*) ceases thereafter to be a criterion of this source.

[2] The LXX of the Pentateuch dates from the third century B.C.

[3] *I.e.* the text printed in ordinary Hebrew Bibles.

[4] *Essays on Pentateuchal Criticism*, 1909, pp. 14–40.

Dahse [1]—other writers, such as Troelstra, merely following in their steps ; and of these two it is Dahse to whom we owe the more elaborate, mature, and recent attack upon the validity of the Divine name as a criterion of authorship.

Dahse makes Ex. vi. 2, 3 (" And God spake unto Moses, and said unto him, I am JEHOVAH : and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, as God Almighty, but by my name JEHOVAH I was not known to them ") the starting-point of his investigations. Now in Gen. and Ex. i.–vi. 1 there exists a group of passages in which JEHOVAH is not used, and in which at the same time *'Ēl Shaddai* occurs (*i.e.* the passages now denoted by " P ") ; and critics have always held that Ex. vi. 3 refers back to these passages, and that it shows at the same time that the many passages in Gen. and Ex. i.–vi. 1 in which JEHOVAH does occur must be by a different writer : these facts thus form, in their opinion, not indeed the *sole* foundation, but *one* of the foundations, of the critical position. The two inferences just referred to being inconvenient to Dahse, he proceeds to relieve himself of them by altering, no less than six times, the Hebrew text. The LXX, wherever *'Ēl Shaddai* occurs in Genesis (xvii. 1, xxviii. 3, xxxv. 11, xliii. 14, xlviii. 3, xlix. 25 [2]), and in Ex. vi. 3, has *my*, *thy*, or *their God*—the pronoun varying according to the context : and Dahse argues that this rendering is not, as had always been supposed hitherto, a *paraphrase* of *'Ēl Shaddai*, but represents the genuine,

[1] Reference has frequently been made, in the present volume, to the *S.P.C.K.* translation of Dahse's article in the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, Sept. 1912, entitled, *Is a Revolution in Pentateuchal Criticism at Hand?* But there the reader is not enlightened as to the radical operations by means of which, as will immediately appear, Dahse would bring about this 'revolution.' For his methods and his results in detail his *Textkritische Materialien zur Hexateuchfrage*, 1912, must be consulted, or the full descriptions given by Dr Skinner in the articles mentioned on p. 181.

[2] See p. 181, *n.* 2.

original text. Accordingly, in six of the seven passages just mentioned, *i.e.* from all except Gen. xlix. 25, Dahse supposes that the original Hebrew reading was not *'Ēl Shaddai*, but *my*, *thy*, or *their God* (as the context in each case would require). Dahse further reads in Ex. vi. 3, with the LXX, the Targum of Onkelos, the Syriac version, the Vulgate, and one Hebrew MS. of the eleventh century A.D., "But my name JEHOVAH I *made not known* to them"[1]; arguing that, although the name JEHOVAH was 'known' to the patriarchs, it had not been 'made known' (*i.e.* revealed) to them by God: the passages in Genesis where JEHOVAH occurs are thus not evidence that it was 'made known' to them by God, and there is no reason why these passages should not be by the same writer as Ex. vi. 2, 3. To be sure, JEHOVAH says "I am JEHOVAH" in Gen. xv. 7, xxviii. 13; but here 'textual criticism' comes conveniently to the rescue; the LXX does not read JEHOVAH in either passage; the original Hebrew, therefore, did not have it.[2] The coast is thus

[1] The reasons which follow are not given by Dahse himself: they are supplied from Wiener and Troelstra (pp. 35, 44 f., 64, 66). The aim of Troelstra's book is to show—following Wiener—that the varying use of the names of God is not reliable evidence that the Pentateuch is of composite authorship, and in particular (by the argument here summarised) that, when the true text of Ex. vi. 2, 3 has been restored, the conclusions commonly drawn from it no longer follow. The reader, when he has gone further into the present appendix, will perhaps understand why Troelstra's attempt is not successful. The Roman Catholic writer, Schlögl, to undermine the critical position still more completely, as he supposes (but see below, pp. 197 ff.), goes so far as (*Expository Times*, xx. p. 563) entirely to eliminate the word *Jehovah* from Gen.–Ex. iii. 12, wherever it occurs in the MT. (*i.e.* 148 times!), though in over thirty cases he has *no* textual support, strong or weak, from any quarter!

[2] The support which Troelstra (p. 65), following Wiener (p. 45), finds for the omission of JEHOVAH in xxviii. 13 from a Hebrew MS. is quite worthless. The MS. is Kennicott's 103, dating, according to Kennicott, from *c.* 1400 A.D., and stated in particular to abound in *omissions*: in this very chapter in *v.* 3 it omits *his mother* after *the brother of*!

clear for Dahse's hypothesis; and the support which Ex. vi. 2, 3 has been supposed to afford for the critical position falls away.

Secondly, Dahse propounds a highly subtle and intricate theory, according to which, as he argues, in the Hebrew text underlying the LXX, JEHOVAH had in the 'Sedarim' (or sections into which the Pentateuch was divided in *Palestine* in order to be read through on Sabbaths in the synagogues, once in three or three and a half years) been changed under certain specified conditions, into *God*; while in the Hebrew text from which the existing MT. is descended, in the longer 'Parashahs,' (or sections into which the Pentateuch was divided in *Babylon* in order to be read through in one year) *God* had been changed, also under certain specified conditions, into *Jehovah*. The present distribution of Divine names, in both the Hebrew text and the LXX, being thus of relatively late introduction, cannot in either be made the basis of a division of the narrative into original sources.

Thirdly, Dahse attaches considerable importance to two groups of Septuagintal MSS. each consisting of three cursive MSS., dating from the tenth to the fifteenth centuries A.D., and identified by him with the recensions of Hesychius and Lucian respectively, in which the Divine name in a number of passages differs from that in the Massoretic text; such variants, he argues, rest upon variants found by the translators in the Hebrew MSS. which they used, and their *difference* from the current MT. creates a presumption that they preserve the original readings of the Hebrew.

Dahse, moreover, alleges that in several cases the readings of these recensions of the LXX, and also other readings of the LXX, agree with the readings preserved in one or more Hebrew MSS. He also quotes cases in

which they have the support of the Samaritan Pentateuch or of some other ancient version.

Such, stated in outline, are the grounds upon which Dahse would bring about the 'revolution in Pentateuchal Criticism' which he anticipates. His attack on the critical position has not passed unchallenged. Hugo Gressmann, in the *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* of May 17 of this year, pointed out the more fundamental weaknesses of Dahse's arguments; and Sellin—the well-known excavator of Taanach and Jericho, and by no means an extreme critic—in a long article in the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, 1913, No. 2, pp. 119 ff., answers each of the two questions, Are Dahse's own hypotheses sufficiently established? and, If they were sufficiently established, would the dominant critical theory be overthrown, or even shaken? in a decided negative.

But the most exhaustive and thorough consideration of Dahse's whole position is that published by Dr. Skinner in a series of articles on *The Divine Names in Genesis* in *The Expositor*, from April to September last year.[1] In the first article Dr. Skinner deals chiefly with Dahse's emendations in Ex. vi. 2, 3, and shows how arbitrary and baseless they are. There is not the smallest ground for questioning the originality of *'Ēl Shaddai* in Gen. xvii. 1, xxviii. 3, xxxv. 11, xliii. 14, xlviii. 3, and Ex. vi. 3. It is particularly to be noted that in Gen. xlix. 25,[2] where the LXX expresses it by "my God," Dahse *himself leaves it*: this passage shows, then, by his own admission, that the LXX

[1] [Now collected under the title *The Divine Names in Genesis*, with the addition of a passage (pp. 136–57 also a note on p. 164 f.) omitted from *The Expositor*: ch. vii of this volume is a reply to Dahse's hypothesis as to the Priestly code, ch. viii to Dahse's article in *The Expositor*, Dec. 1913.—D. C. S., 1924.]

[2] Dahse is right in reading here, with moderns generally, *'Ēl Shaddai* —on account, viz., of the awkwardness of the Hebrew, which is *concealed* in the English versions.

did render *'Ēl Shaddai* by 'God' with a personal pronoun; and it becomes simply impossible to escape the conclusion that, in all the other passages where MT. has *'Ēl Shaddai* and LXX 'God' with a pronoun, the Greek translators read in their Hebrew MSS. *'Ēl Shaddai*, exactly as the Hebrew text reads now. Then, as regards the reading 'made known' for 'was known,' not only is it highly improbable that the easier Hebrew of 'made known' should have been changed into the harder Hebrew of 'was known,' but, if Jehovah was 'known' to the patriarchs (as Dahse allows He was), how was this possible if He had not first 'made' Himself 'known' to them? The idea that He was 'known,' when (as Dahse maintains) He had never revealed Himself, is contrary to all the theological teaching of the Old Testament. It follows that, even if the reading 'I made not known' be adopted, the result will be the same in the view of the writer of Ex. vi. 3: the patriarchs could have neither known nor used the name *Jehovah*. Dahse thus signally fails to show that the Hebrew text of Ex. vi. 2, 3 is incorrect, and that critics are consequently at fault in respect of the conclusions which they have always drawn from it.[1]

In the May number of *The Expositor* Dr. Skinner deals with Dahse's theory that the Divine names in the Septuagint have been varied to suit the exigencies of the *Sedarim*, and those in the MT. to fit in with the *Parashahs*. He shows not only how very artificial and improbable are the alleged grounds for the supposed changes, but also how very imperfectly the theory is supported by the

[1] Troelstra makes no use of the argument based on the LXX's renderings of *'Ēl Shaddai*: the work in which it was first propounded had not appeared when he wrote. The conclusion based by him on the reading 'made not known' is identical with Dahse's, and of course falls through with it.

textual facts themselves.[1] If there is any causal connexion between even a few of these ecclesiastical sections and the alternations of the Divine names, it is the latter which may have influenced the limits of the former; certainly the Divine names were not changed in deference to the requirements of the lectionary.[2]

In his next article, Dr. Skinner points out that Dahse's identification of his two groups of Septuagintal MSS. with the recensions of the Septuagint produced by Hesychius and Lucian (which had been propounded by him before) rests upon very insufficient grounds, and has not been accepted by other scholars. Still more unsubstantial are the grounds upon which Dahse alleges that these two groups of allied MSS. (or 'recensions') rest upon corresponding *Hebrew* recensions, in which the Divine names were preserved more correctly than in the MT.; as a rule they agree with the MT.: no Hebrew MS. of the supposed recension supports the entire group **e g j** in reading a different Divine name from the MT.; and (according to the readings of **e g j** as given by Brooke and M^{c}Lean) even **e j** (which, however, Dahse regards as the best representatives of the 'recension') are supported only in iii. 1b by Kenn. 132, and (doubtfully)[3] in vi. 13 by Kenn. 152.[4] More meagre 'support' from MSS. than this could hardly be imagined. Outside the supposed Hebrew 'recension' one solitary Hebrew MS. (Kenn. 193) also supports **e g j** in

[1] The textual *data* are exhibited in a tabular form on pp. 409-11. It is impossible to describe here in detail the facts on which the conclusions stated in the text rest.

[2] Sellin, in his careful examination, in the periodical mentioned, of Dahse's theory with regard to the *Sedarim* and *Parashahs*, fully corroborates Dr. Skinner's conclusions.

[3] See Skinner, June, p. 508, *n.* 2.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 508 (corrected). The writer learns, through a private communication from Dr. Skinner himself, that he has, on this page, inadvertently over-stated the support which **e g j** receive from Heb. MSS.

one place (xxviii. 20). In the case of **fir** the *one* Hebrew authority (Kenn. 650) which Dahse quotes as supporting it in *one* passage is not a Hebrew MS. at all, but a printed edition of the Talmud, containing a quotation from Gen. xlii. 5, the value of which for the purposes of textual criticism is *nil*!

In the July number Dr. Skinner draws attention to the antiquity and general trustworthiness of the Massoretic text, and explains the grounds for the comparative unimportance of the isolated variants in the Divine names to be found in a few Hebrew MSS. in addition to those just cited. Not only is the support which these MSS. give to variants in the LXX slight, but from at least the second century A.D. the Jews have had a recognised *standard text* of the Old Testament, which they have carefully guarded, and which has been the norm by which the correctness of all MSS. has been judged: and in view of this fact the probability that MSS. dating from the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries A.D., including several known (p. 34) to be carelessly written, preserve readings really older than the MT. is exceedingly slight.[1]

There are in Genesis (see the table in *The Expositor*, July 1913, pp. 33 f.) some twenty or twenty-one cases in which a Septuagintal variant (not always the reading of the standard LXX text) is supported by one to three Hebrew MSS.,[2] and about eighteen cases in which one or more Hebrew MSS. differ from MT. without support from LXX; but the only cases in which these MSS. exceed two or three are where the variant is between יהוה (*Jehovah*) and אדני (*Lord*)—which were *pronounced* alike. Kennicott collated some two hundred and

[1] It is of course not contended here that the existing Hebrew text is free from error—indeed, the contrary is well known to be the case (see p. 189): but the errors came into it before it was thus carefully preserved by the Jews.

[2] In Gen. v. 22 ('And Enoch walked with God') a Hebrew MS. and a Greek MS. agree in omitting the indispensable word 'God'!

ninety Hebrew MSS. containing Genesis, and De Rossi some one hundred and thirty more: if out of all these MSS. the number of the variants in the Divine names found by Kennicott, or deemed worthy of record by De Rossi (for De Rossi does not note *every* variant), is in itself so small, and is supported by so *very* few MSS., can these variants be either of great antiquity or of great value? (See Skinner, *ibid.* pp. 33–37.)

The variants of Hebrew MSS., taken as a whole, are in fact of surprisingly little value (*cf.* Skinner, *Expositor*, July, p. 32 *n.*). Their number (in cases other than the Divine names) is enormous. But they relate, almost entirely, to the common mistakes made by all scribes—differences of orthography, omission of words, *etc.*—and, with rare exceptions, are, like variants of the same kind in MSS. of the N. T., of no value whatever. Not one throws light on the obviously corrupt passages of the MT., so well known, and so perplexing, to every Hebrew student. These can only be corrected, if at all, either by the help of the Ancient Versions or by conjecture. In certain cases various readings, reproduced as footnotes in ordinary Hebrew Bibles, are recognised on the margin of the MT. [see the preface to the Revised Version, under the section 'marginal notes (1)']; and these variants are naturally often largely supported by MSS. Even these, however, seldom relate to matters of importance, and whether the reading of the text or of the marign is superior must be decided in each case on its own merits; neither can *uniformly* be preferred to the other. The variants of isolated MSS. are of the least value of all. In a single chapter, taken at random (Gen. xxii.), there are in Kennicott's collation *forty-four* cases of a word or group of words, some essential to the sense, being omitted in different MSS.—in one case two MSS. agreeing in the omission of an entire verse! One and all, they are obviously due simply to incorrect transcription of the MT.: not one represents the pre-Massoretic manuscript tradition.

In the August issue Dr. Skinner deals with the Samaritan text. He points out, among other significant facts connected with its antiquity—it dates, at the lowest estimate (which, however, depends upon a theory not at present generally accepted), from *c.* 160 B.C., and more probably from the fourth century B.C.—history, and value, that,

in regard to the Divine names, while it differs from the MT. only nine times, it supports it over 300 times; and argues forcibly that, in view of the fact that the Hebrew and the Samaritan texts, from the time that they diverged, were transmitted in entire independence of each other, this very large number of agreements immensely strengthens its claim on our confidence with regard to the transmission of the Divine names.

In his last article Dr. Skinner considers *The Limits of Textual Uncertainty* in the MT., and shows in particular that they are far narrower than Wiener and Dahse suppose. His discussion of this subject is at once thorough and lucid, and one to which even those who cannot follow the intricacies of Dahse's argument, and Dr. Skinner's detailed examination of it in the previous issues, would do well to give their careful consideration.

We may now begin to sum up the results of this investigation. The MT., which was probably fixed substantially as we have it—as may reasonably be supposed, on the basis of the best MS. authorities available—as early as the first or second century A.D., has been handed down in a more careful manner than the Septuagint—or indeed than any other Ancient Version of the Old Testament. As the *official* text, it has been preserved, by the labours of the Massoretes, from many of the possibilities of internal corruption to which it is on all hands admitted that the Septuagintal text has too often fallen a victim. Again, while the Septuagint text is a *translation*, the Massoretic text survives in the *original language* in which the authors of the Scriptures actually wrote; and the chances and opportunities of alteration, it must be obvious, are very much smaller in a *transcription* than in a *translation*. There is also another reason why, in the case of the Divine names, the liability to change is less in the Hebrew than

in the Greek: the difference between that most sacred *proper* name 'JEHOVAH' and the merely *generic* name ''Elōhīm' is great, and would arrest the attention of an ordinarily careful scribe; whereas κύριος and θεὸς are both appellatives, easily interchangeable, often contracted into κς[1] and θς; while the latter was especially prone to take the place of the former, since it came more readily to the pen of a Greek scribe than did the Hebraic κύριος.

The variants of Greek MSS. of the LXX, especially of the cursives, are as a rule of no greater value than those of Hebrew MSS. An immense number—often from a dozen to twenty in a single verse—are registered by Holmes and Parsons (1798–1827), and for the Pentateuch by Brook and M^cLean (1906–12); but they consist almost entirely of the omission of words or groups of words, changes of tense (as aorist for perfect, or *vice versa*), or substitution of a synonym or other word suited to the context (as xxi. 14 ἀπέλυσεν for ἀπέστειλεν, 18, καταστήσω for ποιήσω, xxii. 2, ὁλοκαύτωσιν for ὁλοκάρπωσιν, δείξω for εἶπω; xxvii. 21, φιλήσω for ψηλαφήσω; 25, προσήγαγεν for προσήνεγκεν; xxxv. 1, φανέντι for ὀφθέντι; 2, τοῖς υἱοῖς for τῷ οἴκῳ; 3, ἀπάρωμεν for ἀποβῶμεν; 12, ὥμοσα for δέδωκα), and in the light

[1] Codex Sinaiticus in Tob. xi. 4 contains an excellent illustration of the way in which such contractions of the Divine name were carelessly or wrongly handled by scribes in the Greek text, and is an interesting example of the possibilities of error in this version in the case of the transcriptions of the Divine names. The scribe of this MS. misread κν as κς; hence in this MS. we find 'The *Lord* went with them' instead of 'The *dog* went with them' (see TOBIT in *The Oxford Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, 1913, vol. i. p. 195). On the other hand the general fidelity of Hebrew MSS. to their archetype, as regards the Divine names, is well illustrated, as Dr. Skinner points out (*Expos.*, Sept., p. 279), by Joh. Herrmann in the case of the book of Ezekiel, while there is every reason for believing that the Massoretic text is vastly superior to the Septuagint in this same respect in the dialogues of Job (*ibid.* p. 280).

of variants such as these the substitution of θεός for κύριος, or *vice versa*, has obviously no significance whatever.

The MSS. constituting Lucian's recension, though cursives, stand on a different footing. The text of this recension is indeed in general a very unsatisfactory one, for it abounds in double renderings; but its compiler had access to MSS.—whether Greek or Hebrew—preserving readings, as is plain from 'internal' evidence, genuine and original. Attention was first called to the importance of this recension by Wellhausen in 1871, in his book on the text of Samuel; see also the Notes on Samuel by Driver, and on Kings by Burney. Convincing and valuable corrections of the MT. from this recension will be found; but the originality of all these readings is assured by the superiority of the sense. There are also other groups of cursive MSS. which, if used with judgment and discrimination—as, *e.g.*, by Moore in his Commentary on Judges—yield valuable corrections of the MT.; for an excellent and convincing instance see Judg. i. 16 (Moore, p. 34, or Cooke, in the *Cambridge Bible*, p. 12). But the variants of *isolated* MSS., whether Hebrew or Greek, on which Wiener and Dahse often build, are foundations of sand.

The reasons why a variant in the LXX, in spite of its being based on a Hebrew MS. of the third or second century B.C., cannot, *as such*, be accepted in preference to the MT. are (1) that, in view of the character of an ancient translation, we do not *know* that it is a literal rendering of the Hebrew Text, and (2) that even when we feel sure that it does accurately represent the Hebrew which lay before the translator, the readings thus presupposed are often so unsuitable that they are obviously based upon a corrupt text. For instance, Bathsheba is *always* in the LXX Beersheba, in 2 Sam. iii.–iv. the LXX always has Mephi-

bosheth for Ishbosheth; in the famous passage Is. ix. 6, "And his name shall be called Wonderful Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace," the LXX has "and his name shall be called Angel of great counsel. And I will bring peace upon the rulers, and health to him"; and in Ps. lxviii. 12 for "Kings of armies flee, they flee: and she that tarrieth at home divideth the spoil," the LXX has "The king of the armies of the beloved, of the beloved, and to the beauty of the house to divide spoil." It is not apparent why, upon Wiener's and Dahse's principles, readings such as these—and they might be indefinitely multiplied—ought not to be accepted as the genuine and original readings of the Hebrew. Variants in the Divine names cannot be placed in a category by themselves, and treated upon different principles from other variants: if variants in other words, merely *as such*, cannot be accepted as original readings, neither can variants in the Divine names, merely *as such*, be so accepted. In both cases alike, the variant, *merely as a variant*, has no value; its intrinsic superiority to the MT. is the only really reliable basis that we have for preferring it.

Of course to affirm all this is not to deny that the Septuagint, among many variants which are absolutely worthless, has preserved some which are manifestly superior to those of the Massoretic text, and which in fact point back unmistakably to the actual Hebrew words which the sacred writer must have used; and critics themselves have been foremost in the work of elucidating and utilising them.[1]

[1] Notably Wellhausen in his *Text der Bücher Samuel untersucht* (1871). See also Moore on *Judges*, Driver on *Samuel*, Burney on *Kings*; and almost any volume of the *Century Bible*, or Driver's *Book of the Prophet Jeremiah* (a revised translation, with many illustrations of the value of such emendations). It is the general opinion of scholars that the Revised Version would, in many places, have been materially improved, had readings from the Versions been more freely introduced.

But there is a sentence in Dahse's quotation from Toy[1] which Dahse does not seem to have noticed. After speaking of the MT. and of the text which may be presumed to have been that used by the LXX, he adds that, in comparing the two "in both cases *internal evidence*[2] must decide as to the value of the readings." Exactly so. And this is precisely what Wellhausen, for example, in his book on the text of Samuel (1871) does do. But it is just what Wiener and Dahse do *not* do. They make indeed a show, in a small number of cases, of proving that the variants of the Divine names in the LXX are superior to those of the MT.; but not only have they in these cases very poor success (see pp. 195-7), but in the great majority of instances they make no attempt of the kind at all: they accept, *as such*, the variant of the LXX, or even of isolated MSS. of the LXX, as superior to the MT., without for a moment stopping to enquire whether 'internal evidence,' *i.e.* its relation to the context, etc., shows that it possesses any intrinsic superiority to it. They thus fail to fulfil the condition laid down by Toy in the extract quoted by Dahse. And when H. P. Smith, as also quoted by Dahse,[3] says that "the only answer that can be made to the assertion" that the discrepancies between the Hebrew and the LXX text of Genesis invalidate the critical analysis of the book, is the careful re-examination of the critical data, he is undoubtedly right. It ought not, however, to be forgotten that Wellhausen was a textual critic—and a distinguished textual critic—before he was a 'higher' critic; and it is difficult, or even impossible, to think of the circumspect and clear-sighted author of *Der Text der Bücher Samuel untersucht* as sitting down to work upon the Hebrew text of Genesis—or of the Penta-

[1] *Is a Revolution*, etc., p. 13. [2] The italics are mine.—D. C. S.
[3] *Is a Revolution*, etc., p. 14.

teuch—without first satisfying himself that, for the purpose for which he was about to use it, it was reliable. Other critics also have shown themselves perfectly familiar with the readings of the LXX, and other Ancient Versions, and with the right method of using their variants for the correction of the MT. At the same time, as the validity of the basis has been contested, it is perfectly right that the question of its soundness should be re-examined, in the light of all the known relevant facts. No critic fears the facts; and no critic will demur to the re-examination proposed. It by no means follows, however, as Dahse appears to assume, that the 're-examination' will result in the textual basis on which critics have hitherto worked being shown to be unsound; it is, antecedently, equally possible that it will result in its soundness being *confirmed.* It is certain, at any rate, that, so far as the 're-examination' has hitherto proceeded, the text which critics have taken as their basis has not been shown to be untrustworthy. And even though, in the end, this should be shown to be the case, the effect upon the critical position, as will appear later (see pp. 197-201), will be by no means so serious as seems in some quarters to be anticipated.

What, then, is this 'internal evidence' to which H. P. Smith attaches such supreme importance? No scholar, it must be remembered, accepts *every* variant of the LXX: as has been said above, no scholar doubts that the majority of the variants which appear in the LXX are quite worthless. The question thus arises: What criteria are there for the scholar to employ in differentiating between the Septuagintal variants? On what grounds does he hold that (1) in one case the Septuagint has preserved a translation of the original Hebrew which the Massoretic text has lost, whereas (2) in another case the Massoretic text has preserved the original Hebrew, and the Septuagint

has not done so? In the textual criticism of the MT. it is of the first importance to understand, and always keep in mind, the principles which the answers to these questions involve.

In the first place, then, the textual critic must ascertain whether the text before him in the Septuagint is the *original* text of that version, and not an internal, or 'inner-Greek,' corruption of the original text. Now, in the case of the names of God, it is admittedly difficult to determine this question. Two, three, or more various Greek variants may exist in the extant MSS.—but *only one* of them can possible represent the original Septuagint, and it may be that none of them is original. Where MSS. differ, it is reasonable to suppose that the MSS. most generally accepted as best and most reliable are the most likely to represent the original LXX.

But, in the second place, let it be supposed that the textual scholar is satisfied that he has the *original Greek* text of the Septuagint before him, to what extent does it necessarily represent the exact *Hebrew* text which lay before the translators? Here there are two things which must always be borne in mind:—

(1) It must always be remembered that ancient translators did not confine themselves to a literal, word-for-word translation, as modern translators, for example the English Revisers, seek to do. On the contrary, in dealing with an ancient translation, whether of a sacred or of a secular work, the tendency to express the general sense, and sometimes even to indulge in paraphrase, or to introduce explanatory additions, must be taken into account. And there are abundant indications that the LXX, at times to a small extent, at other times to a very considerable extent, contains examples of this paraphrastic type of translation, and somewhat free reproduction of the sense

of the original. Hence not *every* Septuagintal reading, though it differs from the Massoretic text, necessarily presupposes a different *Hebrew* text. And if the Septuagint, or any other version, shows evident marks of freedom, it is self-evident that, in this particular question of the tradition of the Divine names, the translator may not always have reproduced the exact Divine name which lay before him in the text from which he was translating. If he sees the sentence "And Jehovah said," he may render it by 'the LORD,' or, if the name has been mentioned shortly before, he may omit it, or it is equally possible that he may substitute for it the name *God*.

(2) But, to come now to the cases in which there are good reasons for supposing that a variant in the LXX (or other version) really presupposes a variant in the Hebrew text used by the translator, by what principles can it be decided whether this Hebrew variant is or is not superior to the Massoretic text? In the answer to this question we come to that 'internal evidence' to which H. P. Smith attributes, rightly, such a decisive importance. The main and most important principles are these:[1] (*a*) the text which yields the better sense has the greater claims to originality, and (*b*) the text which is superior on philological and grammatical grounds is to be preferred. These, in the main, are the sole principles which give us the needful *guarantee* that the variant text presupposed by the LXX, or other version, is more original than that of MT.

The present writer is not aware of any commentator, or Hebrew scholar, who emends the Hebrew text *merely* because there is a variant in the LXX or in other versions.

[1] Compare, more fully, Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek*, 1900, pp. 444 f., and Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of Samuel*, 1913, pp. xxxviii–xxxix, xlv–xlvi; see also Dr Skinner's treatment of the limits of textual uncertainty, already referred to, in the September issue of *The Expositor*, esp. pp. 272–5.

Duhm emends the MT. as much as any one—often from the versions, often also by conjecture ; but when he emends from a version he does so not *merely* because the version has a different reading, but for some—real or supposed—improvement in the Hebrew, either on one or other of the two grounds mentioned above, or because his theory of Hebrew metre requires it. Now *in the case of the Divine names*, which are practically synonyms, it is rarely, if ever, possible to show that a variant of the Septuagint, or other version, or of a Hebrew MS., is superior to the Massoretic text either on the ground that it yields a better sense, or on the ground that it is preferable for philological or grammatical reasons. And there is the less reason to suspect error in Genesis, because the MT. of this book (as indeed the MT. of the Pentateuch generally), at least in its prose parts—though of course it includes corrupt or suspicious passages—contains, as a rule, nothing to suggest corruption even to a critical reader ; it runs smoothly and idiomatically, and bears every appearance of having been carefully handed down. This being the general character of the text, it is more than usually hazardous to emend it, when the text itself furnishes no ground for the supposition that it is incorrect. The method by which Wiener and Dahse would emend some of the best preserved parts of the MT. on the ground of *mere* variants, and these often not in the LXX itself, but only in isolated and late MSS., is utterly unsound,[1] and is without any parallel even amongst those scholars who are the most ready to correct the MT. by the help of the Versions.

[1] Suppose it were a question whether St. Paul used always 'Christ' or always 'Jesus,' or whether he used one name in one Epistle and the other in another one. Textual critics would universally agree that such a question could only be decided by an appeal to the best MSS. : they would also unanimously agree—however much they might differ as to which were the best MSS.—that to pick out from every MS., early or

It is only in a *very* few of the cases in which Wiener and Dahse make some show of applying these criteria, that they can be said to substantiate the originality of the readings of the Versions which they would substitute for those of the MT. Thus in Gen. xvi. 11 it is contended that the Massoretic text is "demonstrably" wrong, because the name Ishmael (='May God (*'El*) hear') is explained by 'Because JEHOVAH hath heard'; thus, it is urged, we must accept the reading 'Because *God* (*'Elōhīm*) hath heard,' given by two cursive MSS. of the Septuagint, **b w**, the Old Latin Version (based on LXX), and one Hebrew MS., which is described by de Rossi as a carelessly written MS. of the thirteenth century. The initial mistake made by Wiener and Dahse, along with their unsuspecting followers, is fairly obvious. *'Elōhīm* and *'Ēl* are not convertible terms. The *-el* of *Ishmael* is no more *'Elōhīm* than it is *Jehovah*, but an archaic name for the Deity, used frequently in poetry, but in prose confined to particular expressions[1]—and in fact hardly ever occurring except with some epithet attached to it. Hence, in explaining the etymology of *Ishmael*, unless he had determined to write *archaically* 'because *'Ēl* hath heard'—though no such sentence occurs in prose in the

late, good or bad, the name which supported a particular conclusion would inevitably lead to an unsound result. And this is what the method of Dahse and Wiener essentially is.

It will perhaps be replied that the cases are not parallel: the variant in the LXX *differs* from MT., and therefore has the presumption of representing the more original reading. But, as we have seen, whether this is the case or not depends on the *nature* of the difference: the difference may be due only to loose rendering, or to an explanatory addition: and it is only when 'internal evidence' supports the variant, or, in other words, it is only when the variant yields a satisfactory Hebrew text, instead of the unsatisfactory existing Hebrew text, that we have any *guarantee* that it represents the original reading.

[1] See particulars in Driver, *Genesis*, p. 403.

whole of the Old Testament—a writer who customarily used *'Elōhīm* would write 'because *'Elōhīm* hath heard,' as the writer of the duplicate account in xxi. 17 does actually write; while a writer predisposed to use *Jehovah* would naturally write, as he does in Gen. xvi. 11, 'because *Jehovah* has heard.' But the matter is clinched by 1 Sam. i. 20, which at once shows that the argument is fallacious, and that the desired conclusion does not follow; for there too we read, in the explanation of the current etymology of Samuel (Heb. *Shemū'ēl*), containing similarly the name *'Ēl*, "for from *Jehovah* I asked him": if 'Samuel' can be explained by a sentence containing *Jehovah*, why cannot 'Ishmael' be so explained likewise?[1] Even weaker, again—in fact almost ludicrous—is Dahse's attempt to show that the author of Gen. xxix. 32 must have used *'Elōhīm*, not *Jehovah* (as in MT.), in his explanation of the name Reuben. The name Reuben being difficult to explain etymologically, it has been supposed (by others before Dahse) that the original form of the name was Reub*el* (as the Peshitta always has it); and Dahse adopts this. But no root *ra'ab* is known; so Reubel cannot be shown to contain the name *'Ēl*. And even if this were the *primitive* form of the name, the writer's explanation by (see R.V. marg.) *rā'āh be'onyī* shows conclusively that *he* knew only the form still preserved in MT., Reub*en*. The only one of the cases quoted in which it does seem possible that a Divine name is rightly omitted by LXX and Peshitta is in Gen. xiv. 22: but this was not left

[1] An attempt made by Dahse (*Expos.*, Dec. 1913, p. 486) to neutralise this argument by appealing to the Septuagintal readings (see *Expos.*, July 1913, p. 42) corresponding to the Hebrew 'JEHOVAH of hosts' (as *vv.* 3, 11) is beside the point: the fact remains that a name compounded with *'Ēl* is explained by a sentence containing JEHOVAH—whether without or (admitting the addition to be original) with 'of hosts,' obviously makes no difference to the argument.

to Wiener and Dahse to discover; it was recognised by critics themselves long ago, as by Ilgen (in 1798), Dillmann (1892), and Gunkel (1901).

Wiener and Dahse, then, have entirely failed in their attempt to demonstrate that, so far as the Divine names are concerned, the Massoretic text is less reliable than the Septuagint; and that these names are to so great an extent a variable element in the textual tradition that no inferences can be drawn from them as to the composite character and sources of the Pentateuch.

The great importance which the alleged uncertainty of the Divine names in the Hebrew text of Genesis possesses in the eyes of those who thus insist upon it—and probably at the same time in the eyes of many of their readers—rests, it must be remembered, on a misconception, as serious as it is extraordinary: both the writers who urge this uncertainty, and those who follow them, have enormously exaggerated ideas of the importance of the Divine names, as though these names constituted the chief, or even the sole, criterion of authorship. They ignore, all but entirely, the other criteria on which critics rely. But, in fact, the Divine name is but *one* of the fifty words and phrases set forth as characteristic of P in the Appendix to Ch. III.; while, within that chapter,[1] two other distinct lines of evidence—those of representation and point of view—have been dealt with, both pointing to the same conclusion, and both being quite independent of arguments based upon the alternations in the use of the Divine names. The critics' position, thus, does *not* depend on the varying use of the Divine names, either alone or even chiefly. It rests upon the combination of three *distinct* lines of evidence; and, even if one-fiftieth of one of these had to be given up, the force and cogency of the rest would remain

[1] Pp. 48–55.

entirely unimpaired. For instance, even though it were granted that the Divine names in Gen. ii. 4b–iii. varied in the original Hebrew text as much as they vary in the LXX,[1] the fact that this section is the work of a different author from that of Gen. i.–ii. 4a would still remain as clear as possible from the other considerations adduced on pp. 44-51 above.

The correctness of the statement that the Divine names are not the sole or even the chief criterion of authorship upon which critics rely seems in some quarters to be questioned. But it is perfectly true, as any one can easily ascertain for himself who cares to do so. Any one who will open the Commentary of, say, Dillmann (1892) or Holzinger (1898), will find at the beginning of the several sections, a synopsis of the linguistic and other criteria marking their sources, often of considerable length, and, except possibly sometimes in the case of E, containing a great deal more than merely one of the Divine names. And, in this country, speaking of P, Driver in 1891 (*Introd.*, ed. i, p. 8) expressly emphasized the *combination* of linguistic and other criteria, as justifying the inference that the sections in which they occur are the work of a different hand from the rest of the book. There are also, it should be remembered, some twenty passages in Genesis in which *God* does not occur at all, but in which the other criteria enable critics to assign them without the smallest hesitation to P. And in JE, in the Joseph-narratives, neither name occurs in Ch. xxxvii., and Jehovah not in Chs. xl.–xlviii, and yet the composite character of these chapters is very evident. The idea that the Divine names are the sole or even the chief criterion of authorship in the Pentateuch

[1] Which (in Swete's text) has, for LORD *God* (JEHOVAH 'ELŌHĪM), *God* in ii. 5, 7, 9, 19, 21 (LORD, or *God*, for LORD God, appearing also several times besides in particular MSS.).

is an illusion that can only have sprung up in the minds of those who have never paid attention to what critics themselves have actually and repeatedly said. In claiming Wildeboer as holding the opinion that the Divine names form the only "firm foundation" for the "source-theory," Troelstra (p. 29) has fallen into serious error, and has in consequence led Dr. Wace, in a paper (p. 4) read before the Victoria Institute on June 5, 1913, to do the same: in the passage which he quotes, Wildeboer (*Letterkunde des Ouden Verbonds*, 1893, pp. 157 f., ed. 2, p. 160) is speaking not of the "source-theory" in general, but solely of JE! ("Source-theory" is in fact a mistranslation of Mr. McClure's: "de ontleding" means "the analysis," viz. of JE, to which alone the entire paragraph relates). Even, therefore, though the criteria of the Divine names should be shown to be unreliable, the consequence would be that what would be "taken away" would be not, as Troelstra represents, the "base of the whole newer criticism" (!) but at the most—granted the correctness of Wildeboer's canon—only the analysis of JE. Wildeboer himself, however, in spite of the principle which he lays down, is so conscious (*ibid.*) of the evident marks of composition in the Joseph-narratives (in Chs. xl.–xlviii. of which, as has been said above, the name Jehovah does not occur at all) that he fully accepts the critical analysis of them.[1]

In conclusion, then, it only remains once more to point out the real value of the Divine names. Their alternations suggested to Astruc the hypothesis of the composite character of the Pentateuch; but, as we saw in Ch. II., succeeding critics gradually realised that the Pentateuch contained a number of quite distinct criteria, which partly

[1] Of course anyone conversant with Wildeboer's position would have seen at once that Troelstra's statement was a mistake.

supported, partly enlarged, and partly corrected, the conclusions which Astruc, pioneer as he was, had reached. We saw too that, so far as P is concerned, the criterion of the Divine name holds good only as far as Ex. vi. 2; whereas critics, as soon as they realised, and relied on, the presence of other criteria, were able to formulate a hypothesis of the origin not only of Gen.–Ex. vi. 2 but of the *whole* Pentateuch. We may remark that the separation of P from JE after Ex. vi. 2, in spite of the failure of the name *God* (*'Elōhīm*) as a criterion, is quite as certain as it is before that point in the narrative. We have observed too that so far did critics depart from Astruc's use of the Divine names as the sole criterion that, beginning with Hupfeld, they advanced to the point at which they could unhesitatingly argue that the Pentateuch contained, in addition to the Jahvistic sections, the writings of *two* distinct authors, who, before the theophany to Moses, both ordinarily used *'Elōhīm*—a hypothesis obviously impossible unless the distinction depended on characteristics of these two sources other than that which both had in common, namely the Divine name *'Elōhīm*. It has been pointed out also that the alternations in the use of the Divine name play *no* part at all in the critics' dating of Deuteronomy and their investigations of its sources. The contents of Deuteronomy, in turn, quite bear out the critical conclusion that P is distinct from, and later than, JE. Moreover, the light shed by Hebrew History, and by the course of God's providential and progressive Self-revelation, upon the growth of the Pentateuch again corroborates the critical hypothesis—a corroboration, once more, which is entirely independent of the alternations in the use of the Divine names.

These, then, are the reasons why it was said above that the attempt to overthrow 'higher' criticism by 'textual'

criticism[1] is not merely doomed, but '*fore*doomed,' to failure. It is *fore*doomed to failure, because, if all that is maintained by these textual critics could be proved, if even Schlögl's drastic elimination of the name JEHOVAH from Gen. ii. 4–Ex. iii. 12 were accepted in its entirety, the critical position would not, in any essential point, be weakened. The textual criticism of Wiener and Dahse takes account of only *one* of a multitude of criteria—and that, as critics themselves are perfectly aware, ceasing all but entirely after Ex. vi. 2; but all the other criteria would, in the case supposed, retain their cogency unimpaired, and the critical position, as a whole, would remain unaffected. *Some* parts of the analysis of JE into J and E sources would no doubt be less certain than they are now, but others would be practically untouched.[2] The separa-

[1] The term 'criticism,' as applied to the methods of Wiener and Dahse, is in a way a misnomer. Is there really any 'criticism'—*i.e.* (see p. 1 above) discrimination—in it at all? Every variant of a Divine name, in any Version, or any MS. of a Version, however late and indifferently written it may be, is apparently accepted by them in preference to MT., without discrimination, or adequate inquiry either into its intrinsic probability, or into the date or value of the MSS. which support it. This would probably not be allowed by them in theory, but it is certainly what they appear to do in practice. Notice, for instance, the case cited above, p. 179, *n.* 2, and Gen. v. 22 (p. 184, *n.* 2), which Wiener quotes in his list of important Hebrew corroborations of variants in Greek MSS.!

[2] It would have been better if Dahse, in his reply to Skinner (*Expos.*, Dec. 1913, pp. 481 ff.), had on pp. 481 f. represented the facts somewhat more fully. It is true that the writers whom he mentions do speak as he states; but, though they think that Dahse is right in calling attention to the textual aspects of the problem (*cf.* p. 190 above), do they follow him in the conclusions which he draws from his investigations, or admit for a moment that he has shaken the main critical position? Notice, for instance, Sellin's emphatic words quoted above (p. 181). It is strange that Dahse fails altogether to see that the utmost that the line which he has adopted could, even in the most favourable circumstances, enable him to accomplish, would be to weaken the analysis of JE. And this is the least important element in the critical position.

tion of P from JE, and its date, would still remain. The distinct authorship of Deuteronomy, and its date, would also remain. The verdict of Hebrew History would likewise remain. No *vital* point of the critical hypothesis would be affected at all; but the whole magnificent fabric, built as it is on an infinitely surer foundation than our opponents in the least realise, would stand firm to witness to the methods which it has pleased God to employ to educate His people progressively into a higher and more complete knowledge of Himself.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

RECENT LITERATURE

THIS Appendix is intended to assist the reader in his selection of additional commentaries and books of reference published since the date of the first impression of this book; it should be regarded as supplementing, not superseding, the works already recommended in this book in footnotes on the pages noted below.

A. General Introduction.

J. R. Cohu, *The Bible and Modern Thought*, 1920.

Sellin, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, translated by W. Montgomery, with an Introduction and a Bibliography for English readers by A. S. Peake, 1923.

[*Before* 1914: see pp 16, 22, 34 of the present volume.]

B. Commentaries and special studies.

(1) One volume Commentary:

A. S. Peake, *A Commentary on the Bible*, 1920 (containing in addition a series of articles designed to summarize the generally accepted results of Biblical Criticism, History and Theology).

(2) The Pentateuch:

(*a*) General: J. Skinner, *The Divine Names in Genesis*, 1914 *.

(*b*) Genesis: H. E. Ryle (Cambridge Bible), 1914.
Leviticus: Chapman and Streane (Cambridge Bible), 1914.
Deuteronomy: G. A. Smith (Cambridge Bible), 1918.

[*Before* 1914: see pp. 3, 59, 83, 95, 145.]

(3) Historical books and studies of historical problems:

Joshua: G. A. Cooke (Cambridge Bible), 1918.

Judges: C. F. Burney, *The Book of Judges*, 1918.
C. F. Burney, *Israel's Settlement in Canaan*, 1918.

* See p. 181, *n.* 1.

Ezra and Nehemiah: L. E. Browne, *Early Judaism*, 1920 (an examination of problems raised by the study of these books and their period).

Cowley, *Jewish Documents of the Time of Ezra*, 1919.

Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century, B. C.*, 1923.

[*Before* 1914: see pp. 141, 189.]

(4) The literature and teaching of the Prophets and Apocalyptists:

(*a*) General:

Driver, *The Ideals of the Prophets*, edited by G. A. Cooke, 1915.

Buttenweiser, *The Prophets of Israel*, 1914.

B. Gordon, *The Prophets of the Old Testament*, 1916.

A. C. Welch, *Visions of the End*, 1922.

T. H. Robinson, *Prophecy and the Prophets in Ancient Israel*, 1923.

Peake, *The Roots of Hebrew Prophecy and Jewish Apocalyptic*, 1923.

C. Alington, *Why we read the Old Testament*, 1924.

W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Books of the Apocrypha*, 1916 (for Apocalyptic, see pp. 90–112, 198–223, 509–32).

H. M. Hughes, *The Ethics of the Jewish Apocryphal Literature* (no date).

(*b*) Isaiah: Oesterley, *Studies in Isaiah xl–lxvi*, 1916.

Jeremiah: L. E. Binns (Westminster Commentaries), 1919.

J. Skinner, *Prophecy and Religion: Studies in the Life of Jeremiah*, 1922.

G. A. Smith, 1923.

Ezekiel: Lofthouse, *The Prophet of Reconstruction*, 1920.

Hosea: Melville Scott, *The Message of Hosea*, 1921.

Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical books: translated with brief introduction by various editors in the S.P.C.K. 'Translations of Early Documents. First Series: Palestinian—Jewish and Cognate Texts (pre-Rabbinic)'.

[*Before* 1914: see pp. 117, 138, 175.]

(5) The Psalms:

Driver, *Studies in the Psalms*. Sermons, edited by C. F. Burney, 1915.

Sanday, *The Psalms Explained*, 1918.

Peters, *The Psalms as Liturgies*, 1922.

(6) The 'Wisdom' Movement:

(*a*) General: Oesterley, *The Books of the Apocrypha*, 1916 (especially pp. 11–89, 224–50, 321–71, 455–78).

(*b*) Job: M. Jastrow (junr.), *The Book of Job*, 1920.
Driver and Gray (Int. Crit. Com.), 1921.
Ball, *The Book of Job*, 1922.

Ecclesiastes: M. Jastrow (junr.), *A Gentle Cynic, Being the Book of Ecclesiastes*, 1919.

Ecclesiasticus: Oesterley, *The Wisdom of Ben-Sira* (in the S.P.C.K. 'Palestinian Jewish Texts'), 1916.

Wisdom of Solomon: Oesterley (in S.P.C.K. 'Hellenistic Jewish Texts').

[*Before* 1914: see p. 173.]

C. Theology and Religious Customs.

G. A. Barton, *The Religion of Israel*, 1918.

Oesterley, *Immortality and the Unseen World*, 1921.

Peake, *Brotherhood in the Old Testament*, 1923.

G. B. Gray, *Sacrifice and Priesthood*, edited by T. H. Robinson (in the Press).

[See also under B. (4) above. *Before* 1914: see pp. 117, 119, 141, 155, 157, 158, 160, 161, 168, 171, 172, 175.]

D. Books useful in connexion with the Comparative Study of Hebrew History and Religion and those of neighbouring nations.

L. W. King, *Legends of Babylon and Egypt in Relation to Hebrew Tradition*, 1918.

S. Langdon, *The Epic of Creation*, 1923.

A. Weigall, *The Life and Times of Akhnaton, Pharaoh of Egypt*, new and revised edition, 1922.

Peters, *Bible and Spade*, 1922.

G. F. Moore, *History of Religions*, vol. ii (Judaism, Christianity, Mohammedanism), 1920.

Cambridge Ancient History, vol. i, 1923; vol. ii, 1924.

A. W. F. Blunt, *Israel before Christ, an account of Social and Religious Development in the Old Testament*, 1924.

[*Before* 1914: see pp. 35-40, 44, 85, 86, 92, 93, 124, 133–5, 136, 152.]

INDEX OF SUBJECTS, AUTHORS, ETC.

Ad- Hoeker, 100 n.
Aged, the Great, Life of, composite character of, 9.
Ahaz, sign and thought of, 2 f.
—— and the development of Hebrew Religion, 30 f., 34 f., 251; see also under Isaiah.
Ahikam, 87, 97, 123 n., 154 n.
Ahimaaz and Ithra and the prophets (in Chron.), 72, 76
Akedah, Elohistic account of, confusion of, 42
Akhenaten and Pentateuchal Criticism, 37–40
—— and the Egyptian names in Genesis, 40
—— and the expression of the Word, 40
Aaron, 6, 24 f., 28, 29, 166 f.
—— Deuteronomic or Priestly authorship of, 11
Amaziah, campaign of, 92 f.
Amiaud, W. E., 141 n.
Amram, G. A., 99
Amraphel, meaning of, 75
Amyraut, M., 38 n.
Ananias, R., 2 n.
Anaud and Ithra, 36 f.
Ancient accuracy of, 14
Andrae, A. A., 12 n.
Anna, P., 91 n.
"Anonymity of Moses," 106 f.
Anthropomorphisms, A., 26
Antigonus, J. M., 36 n., 183 n., 186 n.
Antonius, Inscription, A., 11
Apocalypse and Mythology, 193, 197
Apocrypha, A. A., 22 n., 117 n.
Apocrypha, 25 n.
Apollo, P. C., 3 n.
Aramaic, K., 91 n., 99 n., 97, 112 n., 161 n., 183 n., 186 n.
Aramaic, C. F., 93 n., 101 n., 116 n., 163, 165 n.
Archaeology and Hebrew, 3 n., 11 n., 12 n., 23 n., 30 n., 60, 61, 79 n., 84 n., etc.
Ark, A., A. T., 22 n., 24 n., 29 n., 97, 97 n., etc.
Asher, A. M., 175 n.
Assyria, C. K., 2 n., 21 n.
Authors in the Books of, composite character of, 9, 16
—— and Pentateuchal Criticism, 140 n., 146
Auer, K. A., 29 n.
Auke, G. A., 117 n., 188
Covenant, Book of the, 58, 69, 92, 91 n., 97, 98 n., 104–10, 123 f., 132–44; see also under Humanism, Deuteronomy, etc.
Creation narratives, 41–51, 92
Creation, A., 3 f.; Babylonian, 3; Canaanite or Egyptian, 2 f., 6 f., 21; Mosaic, 3 n.; Pastoral or Lower, 3, 7, 21, 202
Creed, W. F., 35 n.

Daniel, 1, 3 f., 34 n., 43 f., 52 n., 57, 93 n., etc.
Daniélou, 136 n.
Date, customary of, 182
Davidson, A. B., 107 n., 201 n., 204 n.
Deuteronomic, and the development of Hebrew Religion, 192 ff.
Deuteronomic history, the, 1 n., 7
Deuteronomy, 94, 122, 124, 126, 146–67, 168–82
—— aim of, 170 f.
—— and literature, 174
—— authorship of, 6 f., 166 f.
—— expansions in, 52 n., 102, 12
—— law of, 124–26
—— source of ideas of, 174–76
—— style of, 172–76
Development of Old Testament Religion, xiii f., 150–55
—— of Legislation, see under Covenant, Book of the; Deuteronomy; Priestly source, etc.
De Wette, W. M. L., 35 n., 145 n.

Septuagint, criteria for criticism of, 186-202
—— Names of God in, 177-202
—— recensions of, 183 f.
'Serpent's Stone,' the, 141
Shiloh, sanctuary at, 142
Sievers, E., 11
Simon, R., 23 f.
Sinai, content of Jehovah's Self-revelation at, 155; *cf.* 56 f.
Skinner, J., 38, 39 *n.*, 73 *n.*, 86 *n.*, 141 *n.*, 178-93
Slavery, laws of, development of, 107-109
Smith, G. A., 95 *n.*, 117 *n.*
Smith, H. P., 8 *n.*, 190, 191
Smith, M. Linton, 40
Smith, W. Robertson, 32 *n.*, 117 *n.*, 157 *n.*
"Song of Moses," 90 f.
Spies, narratives of the, 58
Spinoza, 22 *n.*
Stade, B., 131, 137
Staerk, 132 *n.*
Stähelin, J. J., 30 *n.*
Stanley, Dean, 27, 29 *n.*
Steindorff, 85 *n.*
Steuernagel, C., 22 *n.*, 26 *n.*, 27 *n.*
Stone and Simpson, 119 *n.*, 120 *n.*, 152, 168, 175
"Supplementary hypothesis," 29 f.
Swete, H. B., 133 *n.*, 193 *n.*, 198 *n.*

TATIAN, *see under Diatessaron*
Tel-el-Amarna Tablets, 36.
Temple, W., 150
Tobit, Book of, light thrown by, upon Jewish Colony at Elephantine, 132 *n.*
Tobit, name of God wrongly inserted in, 187 *n.*
Tovey, D. F., 3 *n.*
Toy, C. H., 173 *n.*, 190
Troelstra, A., 23 *n.*, 24 f., 55 *n.*, 57, *etc.*
Tuch, F., 30 *n.*

UNLEAVENED BREAD, Feast of, in P and in Aramaic papyri, 135 f.
"Urim and Thummim," 130 *n.*

WACE, Dean, 25, 199
Wellhausen, J., 31 f., 67 *n.*, 91, 131 *n.*, 188, 189 *n.*, 190
Whitehouse, *o.c.*, 168 *n.*
Wicksteed, P. H., 12 *n.*, 31 *n.*
Wiedemann, K. A., 134 *n.*
Wiener, H. M., 177, 179 *n.*, 186, 188, 190, 195, 197
Wildeboer, G., 189
'Wisdom'-thought, and the preparation for Christ, 172 f.
Worship, place of, 59 f., 106, 139-46, 156, 159 f., 163-66
Writing, early knowledge of, 36

YEB, Jewish settlement at, date of, 132-34
—— —— in relation to Pentateuchal Criticism, 131-37

INDEX OF SOME BIBLICAL PASSAGES REFERRED TO

	PAGE
Gen. i.-Ex. vi. 3	25-28, 53-58, 72-74, 177-202
Gen. i.-xix.	27
Gen. i.-ii. 4a	26 *n.*, 44-48
Gen. ii. 4b-iv.	26 *n.*, 27, 45-48
Gen. v. 22	184 *n.*
Gen. v. 29	30
Gen. vi. 5-ix. 29	43, 51-55
Gen. xii. 6	22
Gen. xiv. 22	196
Gen. xvi. 5, 6	38
Gen. xvi. 11	195 f.
Gen. xvii.	56
Gen. xix. 29	30 *n.*, 73 *n.*
Gen. xxi. 10, 14	38
Gen. xxi. 17	196
Gen. xxiii.	38
Gen. xxix. 32	196
Gen. xxvi.	75 f.
Gen. xxxvi. 31	22
Gen. xxxvii. 23-xxxix. 1	78 *n.*
Gen. xxxvii.-l.	76-81
Gen. xlix. 5 ff.	140
Ex. iii. 14	74
Ex. iv. 14	140 *n.*
Ex. vi. 2, 3	178-180, 181 f.
Ex. vi. 3	56
Ex. xii. 15, 18	135
Ex. xviii. 11	155
Ex. xviii. 12	156
Ex. xx. 24 f.	139
Ex. xxi. 2-7	107 f.
Ex. xxiii. 6, 8	105
Ex. xxiii. 19	105
Ex. xxxii. 7, 8	102
Ex. xxxiv. 26	105
Lev. ii. 1, 15, 16	135
Num. xxii. 2-xxiv.	82 f.
Deut. i. 1	22
Deut. ix. 12	102
Deut. xiv. 21	105
Deut. xv. 12-18	107 f.
Deut. xvi. 19	105
Deut. xxix. 1	97
Deut. xxxiv. 5, 6	23
Judg. i. 1 f.	139
Judg. i. 16	188
Judg. v. 4, 5, 23	139
Judg. vi. 20	139
Judg. xi. 24	139
Judg. xiii. 19 f.	139
Judg. xvii. 5	139, 140
Judg. xvii. 13	140
Judg. xviii. 17-30	139
1 Sam. i. 20	196
2 Sam. iii.-iv.	188
2 Sam. vi.	140
1 Kings iii. 4, 5	16
1 Kings viii. 3	141
1 Kings xii. 29 f.	139
1 Kings xix. 3, 8 ff.	142
2 Kings xiv. 5-9	17-19
2 Kings xxii. 3-23	145
1 Chron. v. 4	141
2 Chron. i. 3-7	16
2 Chron. xxv. 3-18	17-19
Neh. viii. 17	148
Job	187 *n.*
Ps. lxviii. 12	189
Is. ix. 6	189
Jer. vi. 20	135
Jer. xliv. 1, 15	134 *n.*
Ezek. xl.-xlviii.	146
Ezek. xlii. 13	135 *n.*
Ezek. xliv. 29	135 *n.*
Hos. ii. 5	159
Mal. iv. 4	147
Tob. xi. 4	187 *n.*